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ABSTRACT

Higher education in America has a long tradition of civic engagement education. Although there is theoretical and rhetorical support, many institutions still struggle with implementing effective civic engagement on their campuses. The aim of this study was to provide an understanding of factors that contribute to successful civic engagement, specifically focusing on the affect of presidential leadership.

The study used a limited sample of two groups to provide comparative analysis and offer much needed statistical research for civic engagement. Institutions were identified through the organization Campus Compact and the Carnegie Foundation’s elective Community Engagement classification. Institutions that had joined Campus Compact or applied for the Carnegie classification indicated a mission to civic engagement education. Since recognition with the Carnegie classification is significantly more difficult to obtain that membership in Campus Compact, the Carnegie classification group became the model group for the study. By comparing these two groups through a variety of statistical analysis, conclusions were able to be drawn regarding the extent presidential leadership has on civic engagement and some specific practices that appear to enable success.

The findings indicated a significant difference between the model group and the Campus Compact group in multiple areas. Additionally, the study indicated that presidential leadership is a significant factor in the success level of civic engagement efforts, and it identified certain behaviors for effective leadership.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Context of the Problem

The concept of civic engagement is strongly rooted in the tradition of American higher education (Cohen, 1998; Lucas, 2006). Many of the founding fathers wrote about the importance of an “engaged citizenship” and expressed a specific concern for these values to be taught at the country’s institutions of higher learning (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003). John Adams believed in the concept so much that he included it in the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Wisdom and knowledge, as well as virtue, diffused generally among the body of people being necessary for the preservation of their rights and liberties; and as these depend on spreading the opportunities and advantages of education in various parts of the country, and among the different orders of the people, it shall be the duty of the legislators and magistrates in all future periods of this commonwealth to cherish the interests of literature and the sciences, and all the seminaries of them, especially the university at Cambridge, public schools, and grammar schools in the towns…(Chapter V, Section II, Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts).

Adams felt strongly that the only way a true democracy could exist would be for its citizens to be educated with the values and moral virtues that represent the country, and for that educated society to create “a social compact, by which the whole people covenants with each citizen, and each citizen with the whole people” (McCullough, 2001, p. 221).

The teaching and practice of civic engagement has followed the ebb and flow of the nation’s values and moral virtues. American Colonial institutions were founded with two primary purposes: to educate civic leaders and to prepare clergy (Lucas, 2006). By the 1970s, this trend had evolved into the thought that “discipline-specific knowledge
was to be pursued for its own sake independent of social and political implications and civic obligations” (Wilhite & Silver, 2005, p.47). While the practicality of teaching values and morals has proven difficult, and the debate over the mission of higher education continues, many institutions of higher education have made efforts to build civic engagement on their campuses (Campus Compact, 2010). Although those in favor of civic education would say this is a positive move, the question becomes how an institution develops civic engagement in its students and on its campus. There is little research that prescribes a set list of best practices for developing civic engagement, but there have been several aspects set as indicators of engagement (Zlotkowski, et al., 2004).

Campus Compact was founded in 1985 when a group of university presidents formed “a coalition of college and university presidents committed to fulfilling the civic purposes of higher education” (Zlotkowski et al., 2004, p. 2). This coalition has grown to over 1,100 institutions, demonstrating that there is a resurgence of civic education in higher education. The commitment of each campus president who signs the President’s Declaration shows a common believe that administrative and academic leadership play a key role in the development of civic engagement on a university campus (Campus Compact, 2009). Researchers within the organization developed a list of 13 indicators of engagement to “help campuses both assess their current level of engagement and create strategies to deepen their work” (Zlotkowski et al., p. 4) (Appendix A). The researchers were careful to acknowledge that a campus may have strong engagement without having all 13 indicators, but they set these indicators as benchmarks for developing civic engagement. Within these indicators is administrative and academic leadership, putting emphasis again on the leadership efforts within an institution.
Purpose of the Study

The study examined the affect of institutional leadership in the development of civic engagement, and determined what institutional leadership entails for a university campus. The research on civic engagement development at the college level showed a recurring theme: due to the vast number of variables on each campus, it is not possible to create a scripted plan for successful civic engagement (Colby et al., 2003; Ostrander, 2004; Zlotkowski, et al., 2004). However, although institutions vary in resources, staffing, faculty involvement, structure and more, there is one constant with every campus: presidential leadership. Every campus in the United States has a president, therefore, this study sought to use that as the constant variable in the civic engagement quandary.

The expectation of the study was to provide a clear determination as to the extent presidential leadership has an affect on civic engagement on a university campus. Additionally, the study examined the other areas of leadership that impact civic engagement on university campuses, and identified the specific types of institutional support that encourage a civically engaged campus.

Statement of the Research Questions

This study sought to answer the following four research questions:

1. To what extent did presidential leadership promote civic engagement on a public university campus?

2. To what extent were civic engagement initiatives successful without top level institutional leadership?
3. To what extent did institutional leadership at any level promote civic engagement on a public university campus?

4. What types of institutional support were most effective in developing, supporting, and encouraging civic engagement on a public university campus?

Definition of Terms

To create a common understanding and promote continuity throughout the study, the following terms were defined:

Campus Compact: A not-for-profit organization “committed to fulfilling the civic purposes of higher education” (Campus Compact, 2009), consisting of over 1,100 higher education institutions including public, private, two-year, and four-year campuses.

Civic Engagement Education: Education that teaches students to “make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and motivation to make that difference” (Ehrlich, 2000, p. vi).

Engaged Citizenship: A population that has been educated and prepared for participation in political issues and non-political community issues.

Institutional Leadership: Leadership associated with the campus from any level, including administration, faculty, staff, and students.

Presidential Leadership: The top-level administrator of an individual campus. Associated titles vary from institution to institution; therefore, titles that maybe included under this term are: president, chancellor, and CEO.

Service-Learning: A civic engagement pedagogy combining classroom learning with practical application through service in the community, followed by an opportunity for student reflection.
Success: A university able to obtain the Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement Classification status.

University: The institutions of higher education that are four-year or higher, public institutions.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were used for the study:

1. The underlying assumption of the study was that presidential leadership is the only constant variable on a university campus that is related to civic engagement. Therefore, it was important to examine how the president affects civic engagement development to provide guidelines for universities seeking to renew their commitment to civic education.

2. It was assumed that other levels of leadership contribute to successful civic engagement development on college campuses.

3. It was assumed that university presidents are concerned with civic engagement development for their students and campus.

4. It was assumed that civic engagement is good and a useful concept to teach students.

5. It was assumed that institutions receiving the Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement classification are model institutions for civic engagement efforts.

6. It was assumed that resource allocation, recognition and rewards, training and development opportunities related to civic engagement, and encouragement to develop
programs and courses related to civic engagement are all associated with presidential leadership.

7. It was assumed that successful civic engagement is affected by the amount of support and leadership demonstrated through institutional leadership on a campus.

Limitations and Delimitations

For reasons of focus and manageability, the study had the following limitations and delimitations:

1. The study was limited to the institutions that met the standards for the Community Engagement classification set by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and to institutions that held membership with Campus Compact.

2. The study was further limited to institutions within both groups that were identified as public institutions and four-year institutions. This was done to create a population reflective of only other public, four-year institutions.

3. The study was limited to the data collection timeframe of Summer 2010. Therefore, the responses submitted were reflective of that timeframe’s current presidential and institutional leadership characteristics.

4. The study was limited to the responses of those who were designated as the contact for civic engagement at each institution. Had the surveys been administered to other stakeholders on each campus, the results may have varied.

Significance of the Study

There is frequent discussion about the inadequate civic engagement demonstrated by recent college graduates, as well as the level of importance civic engagement should
hold in a university’s mission (Colby et al., 2003; Sax, 2004; Wilhite & Silver, 2005). While there is evidence of strong community service by this population (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2008), there is a lack of political participation and a seemingly low concern for public issues (Putnam, 2000; Zlotkowski et al., 2004). Colby et al. address the situation in the following passage,

Messages of instrumental individualism and materialism are becoming more and more prevalent in the broader institutional and peer cultures on many campuses. The commercialization of higher education, including corporate sponsorship of faculty and student research, corporate underwriting of programs, advertising on Web sites, and exclusive “pouring rights” given to soda companies at sports and other events, can provide important financial benefits but also reinforces themes of materialism pervasive in the general culture (p. 12).

The issue of commercialization becoming a prevalent value on university campuses is a concern for many higher education practitioners. The proposed solution is for universities to refocus institutional missions toward civic education.

Since the vast majority of institutions include comments related to civic engagement within their mission statements, it should be important to the campuses to authenticate their missions with practice. As stated earlier, given the variances within university campuses, focusing on the one absolute – the campus president – is necessary to build consistency in the process of developing civic engagement.

The relevance of the study is that it incorporated elements of both scholarship and utility by presenting some best practices for developing strong leadership to support civic engagement at public, four-year universities. At this point, research is hesitant to prescribe a set list of best practices to develop civic engagement, because the variables for each campus are so diverse. Since presidential leadership is considered one of the most important aspects of developing strong civic engagement (Campus Compact, 2009),
the examination of presidential leadership, institutional leadership and support for civic engagement at these institutions will hopefully produce a model for other institutions to follow as they seek to develop engaged citizens. Additionally, the majority of research concerning civic engagement is descriptive or case study based. Therefore, the study sought to provide statistical support for civic engagement efforts on university campuses.

**Conceptual Framework of the Study**

The study was driven by the argument that presidents make a difference in institutional behavior. Ward (1996) conducted a series of case studies to determine the essential criteria to develop successful service-learning on college and university campuses. “The findings make clear that successful service-learning takes vision, leadership, financial support, and faculty participation” (p. 22). Since service-learning is a branch of civic engagement, the study here assumes that the factors indicated above will be similar to those needed for successful civic engagement. The research questions provided the main framework of the study and implied a quantitative approach to the research. The research questions were developed through a general thought process, starting with a curiosity about the affect of presidential leadership on the development of civic engagement on university campuses. This concept grew to develop the research questions.

**Chapter Summary**

This chapter explained the development of the study and provided a general framework for the study. Drawing on the concept that a president is the one variable each university shares, the study sought to understand to what extent presidential leadership affects civic engagement on a university campus. Additionally, the study
sought to identify specific factors that contribute to successful civic engagement. The dissertation provides a thorough review of literature related to civic engagement and leadership on university campuses, an explanation of the study design and implementation, an analysis of the results, and a discussion of the findings.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction to the Chapter

The goal of this chapter was to provide an overview of the literature related to the topic of civic engagement in higher education. Additionally, the topic of leadership in higher education was reviewed and noted in the chapter. To facilitate a strong understanding of the research, the chapter was broken down into two primary sections: civic engagement and leadership. Each of these sections was divided into multiple sub-sections to gain a deeper understanding of how each affects higher education.

Approach to the Literature Review

The research for the literature review began with a search through the ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis (Digital Dissertations) database to find dissertations related to the topic of civic engagement in higher education. This was done to provide a background of literature on the topic and to help solidify the research questions for this dissertation. Although the search produced a minimal number of dissertations, it did provide a good source from which to work, as well as ideas for narrowing the scope of the research.

Once the topic was narrowed, a search through ProQuest Academic Search Primer and Ebsco Host produced a large number of references for both leadership in higher education and civic engagement in higher education. Additionally, a general search through library documents provided a rounded approach to the study by producing several books on the topics in question. Much of the literature is from relatively recent sources, dating from 1998 to the present, but for the sake of historical background and the
importance of civic engagement in higher education, some of the literature spans a
greater timeline.

Finally, the non-profit organization, Campus Compact, was included in the research in the form of extensive website perusal and a personal phone conversation with the organization’s President in 2008, Maureen Curley. The organization’s focus on leadership related to the furthering of civic engagement on college campuses was a guiding philosophy in the development of the research questions.

Section I: Civic Engagement in Higher Education

_Civic Engagement: Definition and Relevance_

Since the call for civic engagement education in higher education is based upon the concept of developing good citizenship, it is beneficial to define citizenship. According to Starkey, Hayward, and Turner (2006), the broadest definition of citizenship is the participation of individuals and groups in a given society. It also carries an expectation for responsibility to that society. During the past two decades, higher education has seen resurgence in the civic engagement education mission (Colby, et al., 2003; Ehrlich, 2000; Sax, 2004; Swaner, 2007).

According to Gearan (2005), civic responsibility in higher education is defined as teaching students the values of democracy through both classroom instruction and opportunities for service within the community. He referred to the educational missions of two of America’s early higher education institutions, the University of Pennsylvania and the University of Chicago, both upholding the purpose of higher education to serve mankind and further democracy. Gearan used these two examples to point out the long-standing significance civic engagement has had in higher education.
Benson and Harkavy (2000) referenced the University of Chicago and two of its leaders, who are often referred to as leaders of civic engagement; William Rainey Harper and John Dewey. For these men, civic engagement education was a vital part of a college education since institutions educate people to work in a democratic society. Harper pushed for education that produced “service for mankind” (p. 50).

In 1985, the Carnegie Foundation published a special report focusing on the resurgence of civic education. “Students must be willing to recognize that learning is more than preparation for a career, more than sitting in a class, and more than piling up the credits needed for graduation” (Newman, 1985; p. 15). The report pushed for higher education to reexamine its mission and to prepare students for active citizenship and leadership in all areas of American life.

The college experience should also develop within each student a sense of country and community service and a desire to help others. Patriotism in the best sense means a willingness to believe in and work for improvements in the country. This must not be a welcome byproduct of a college education, but a central, urgent, and conscious purpose (p. 39).

Thomas Ehrlich, one of the leading scholars for the modern civic engagement movement, developed a practical definition of civic engagement. In his book *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education* (2000), he provided this definition:

At the core of the issue, civic engagement means working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and nonpolitical processes (p. vi).

According to Ehrlich (2000), the civic and moral education of students in higher education was originally the central mission, whereas, now it is a very small part of a student’s education in or outside the classroom. This is one of the reasons he and other
civic engagement advocates have put such a strong emphasis on re-developing the civic education of students in higher education. In the journal, *Political Science & Politics* in 1999, he wrote that students cannot learn to be civically engaged by only sitting in a classroom discussing politics. Rather, students need to be able to connect and integrate classroom learning with experiential learning. Once students are able to draw those connections, they will be prepared for lifelong civic engagement. King (1997) connects the teaching of civic engagement with leadership. “Helping students develop the integrity and strength of character that prepares them for leadership may be one of the most challenging – and important – goals of higher education” (p. 87).

Checkoway (2001) called for a renewal of civic engagement as part of the American research institution’s mission.

Many American research universities were established with a civic mission to prepare students for active participation in a diverse democracy and to develop knowledge for the improvement of communities. Today, however, it is hard to find top administrators with consistent commitment to the mission, few faculty members consider it central to their role, and community groups that approach the university for assistance often find it difficult to get what they need (p. 125).

He maintained that the call for civic education is not a new issue for higher education, but rather one that has been seen several times through the history of American higher education. According to Checkoway (2001), there is a connection between the call for attention to civic engagement and any time the general population undergoes significant change; such as growth in the number of immigrants entering the nation. Therefore, the connection between rising diversity within the general population and rising diversity within colleges and universities has become evident. Checkoway stated that it is the responsibility of higher education, specifically research institutions, to
educate students to be civically engaged so that they can improve the society in which they live.

Aronson and Webster (2007) provided a definition of an engaged university as one “that reciprocally engages with the communities it serves in a way that also prepares students to respond to the complex problems of society, promotes social responsibility, and creates good citizens” (p. 266). Based on the historical chartering of land-grant institutions to serve local needs by educating a larger population who would in turn benefit society as trained professionals in their communities (Thelin, 2004), Aronson and Webster made a call to land-grant institutions to revisit their original mission and lead the way in civic engagement education.

*Civic Engagement: Driving Forces*

Thomas Jefferson and John Adams felt strongly that democracy would not work without college educated citizens to make decisions for the nation. From this standpoint, the need for civic education is critical for the continuation of a democratic nation (Lucey, 2002; Thornton & Jaeger, 2006). Nelson (2002) stated that there are three democratic philosophies that shape civic education for colleges and universities.

First is that the democratic heritage of the nation is imbued with fundamental moral, religious, and spiritual beliefs. Second is the notion that America’s colleges have an incumbent duty to nurture the principles underlying civic virtue and democratic values, and that the students’ education should inspire the upholding of those values. Lastly is the Jeffersonian tradition that educated citizens are crucial to maintaining democracy. Public education is federally established and funded because a literate citizenry is essential to the health of democracy (p. 12).

One of the members of The Kellogg Commission (1999) stated

the measure of an educated person is defined as much by what that person can do (and has the will to do) as by what the person knows and by how much he or she
genuinely notices and cares about the consequences of his or her actions…Something is lost when we separate knowledge and responsibility (p. 46).

Research supports this foundational idea by demonstrating several reasons for civic engagement education and programming at higher education institutions. Student desire and expectation to be engaged in community service and civic education is a driving motivation for many campuses. Another strong motivator is the evidence that civic education can actually enhance student learning across curriculum. Additionally, this type of education and involvement supports students’ personal, professional, ethical, and moral development (Galston, 2001; Hollister, Wilson, & Levine, 2008; Savage, 2007).

One of the basic arguments for developing and teaching civic engagement at universities is to breakdown the “ivory tower” image of higher education. Society, at large, has often viewed higher education as unresponsive to the needs of the nation and world, “that we are aloof and out of touch, arrogant and out of date” (Kellogg Commission, 1999, p. 20). Therefore, encouraging civic engagement education at the college level provides a way for institutions to reach out and give back to the communities in which they are located, thereby; stepping down from the “ivory tower” to deal with everyday problems and concerns.

Similarly, Newman, Couturier, and Scurry (2004) commented on the growing gap between public need and what a university gives back. They felt that higher education has a priority to educate and develop students to become active citizens. Additionally, they felt that institutions themselves have a responsibility to relate and give back to their respective communities.
Ostrander (2004) conducted a comparative study on five campuses to examine why each institution participated in civic engagement and how each campus facilitated civic engagement. The study identified five forces driving universities toward civic engagement. First, that universities are facing criticism of inefficiency and debate over the different views of educational goals. Secondly, that there has been a national expectation for college students to have better civic participation during and after college. Thirdly, that there has been a concern that academic learning does not relate to real-world situations. Fourthly, that the nation has seen more serious public concerns during the last decade and graduates need to have a stronger understanding of real-world issues. And lastly, that there has been a growth of everyday issues such as town-gown relations.

Galston (2001) provided a list of various research findings showing the significance of civic engagement education. The following seven findings provide rationale for developing and incorporating civic engagement education into higher education curriculum. First, students who have civic knowledge are better able to draw connections between political processes and their personal interests. Second, students who have an understanding of civic knowledge have a greater tendency to demonstrate consistency across issues and philosophy. This implies that educating students in civic knowledge, provides individuals better understanding of their personal beliefs and therefore, they will formulate political decisions in a more consistent trend rather than random selection. Third, students must have at least a basic level of civic knowledge in order to understand and follow political and societal events. Fourth, students who have general civic knowledge have a greater understanding for other issues that affect the nation. Fifth, an understanding of civic affairs combats general mistrust of public life.
Therefore, it creates individuals who are more likely to analyze those in public office rather than automatically trusting them based on positional power. Sixth, civic education promotes democratic values. Finally, students who have been educated in civic knowledge demonstrate more involvement in the political process in general. Additionally, those students who have had civic education are more likely to view political issues on a more generalized basis, looking more at how the issue affects society rather than just how it affects their personal lives.

Sax and Astin (1997) conducted a study through the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California at Los Angeles to assess the impact of service experiences (service-learning) on the development of undergraduates. Results indicated that participation in service programs, particularly service-learning programs, inspired a greater desire and greater participation in community service, a stronger commitment to promoting diversity understanding, a commitment to community action programs, and a commitment to impacting social values.

Sax and Astin (1997) also evaluated the impact service had on academic development. The survey included ten academic outcomes. In each area, those students that participated in service programs rated higher in academic outcomes than those students who did not participate. Finally, the survey examined eight life skills objectives, and the results were again in favor of those students who had participated in service programs.

Additionally, included in this article was a longitudinal study of over 12,000 students at three different points over a nine year period. The purpose of the study was to determine if participation in service programs in college made a lasting impact for civic
engagement. The results favorably indicated that service programs in college does help students “develop a greater commitment to civic involvement in the years after college” (Sax & Astin, 1997, p. 29). The results also indicated that students who participated in service programs as undergraduates were more likely to attend graduate and professional programs, and that these students were more likely to give back financially to their undergraduate institutions.

Interestingly, Sax revisited the study in 2004 and found that while student participation in service programs during the college years was high, it dropped off significantly after college. However, the longitudinal study showed that participants who had college experiences related to engagement did exhibit a continued impact on their overall development of civic responsibility, particularly the values and attitudes related to civic responsibility such as understanding and valuing diversity. Given the more recent findings, Sax suggested that institutions continue their civic engagement missions, but that they not limit themselves to a few specific programs, or a few classes on civics. Rather, she commented that “education for citizenship can be accomplished more broadly by encouraging students to become active and proactive participants in the learning process, pursing their own interests and making meaningful connections with students and faculty” (p. 78).

Pascarella (1997) commented on the need for civic education to build moral reasoning in students. His findings indicated that college students make significant gains in moral reasoning between their freshmen and senior years. After reviewing a multitude of studies regarding moral reasoning, he concluded that individuals with a college education hold civic engagement principles at high levels. This was reinforced by
Swaner (2007) who referred to the cognitive development that takes place during college. Swaner stated that as students are exposed to new thoughts and experiences, they develop new perspectives and understandings of their communities. They learn to combine their classroom learning with experiences and build a personal educational foundation based on that combination.

Harward (2007) stated that higher education has been under pressure to provide actual outcome measurements. Measurements are needed across academic and student affairs, but specifically for any civic engagement initiative. According to Harward, one of the major driving forces for outcome measurements is that “higher education institutions have been too long receiving public financial support without real accountability” (p. 5). This argument drives the justification of civic engagement programs because if the programs are successful, they will produce both direct and indirect results in society.

Civic Engagement: Challenges

There have been a multitude of challenges facing civic engagement development on college and university campuses. The following sub-section will cover what the research reveals as the primary challenges.

According to Ward (1996) one of the greatest variances in higher education civic development is the level of support and real involvement by the institution. Ward noted that there are two types of reportedly engaged institutions: those that incorporate service as part of the academic experience, and those that merely express it rhetorically. “For institutions in the latter category, ‘service’ is expressed in mission statements, but active public service on behalf of students, faculty, and administrators is not part of the campus
culture nor is it supported or rewarded” (p. 3). This creates a challenge for the progress of civic engagement development, as campuses in the second category are less likely to develop real engagement programs when they can receive credit for rhetoric. Additionally, she noted that the organizational structure of university campuses contributes to the challenge of institutionalizing civic engagement. Most institutions are organized in a manner that creates separate functioning areas, therefore, making it difficult for those individuals on campus who are actively engaged in civic education to influence campus-wide policies and initiatives. The Kellogg Commission (1999) also addressed this “decentralized nature of academic governance” (p. 20), citing it as a problem not only for the development of civic engagement, but also as a contributor to the average American’s perception of higher education: “They don’t understand its structure or purpose, even less how it functions or how it is financed” (p. 20).

Caputo (2005) discussed a variety of obstacles facing the development of civic engagement on college campuses. He commented on the fact that liberal arts campuses seem to have better success developing a civic engagement focus than other campuses across the nation (Caputo, 2005; Thornton & Jaeger, 2006). His reason for this difference is the variance in diversity between these two types of campuses. Non-liberal arts colleges are typically required to have more flexible degree programs to fit the needs of their diverse populations; thereby, creating a challenge to incorporate a standard set of civic engagement protocols into the curriculum. This is supported by a four-year longitudinal study examining the progression and continuation of civic engagement by students enrolled in the Bonner Scholars’ Program conducted by Keen and Hall (2009). They found that students attending liberal arts colleges maintained a stronger level of
service and civic engagement than students at other types of institutions. Pascarella (1997) found that the largest gains in moral reasoning, and therefore in civic engagement, were attained at liberal arts colleges. Newman (1985) also addressed the fact that some campuses have an easier time developing civic engagement in their students than others. His focus, however, was on the size of the institution, as at large institutions students “feel the most isolated and the least involved” (p. 58).

Another obstacle for civic education and engagement is the role of the faculty. According to Caputo (2005), “Without the faculty’s interest and active support, a successful civic engagement program is next to impossible” (p. 6). Newman (1985) noted that faculty have a tendency to view civic education as teaching morals and values, and that faculty members feel they should not engage in such instruction. Similarly, Pascarella (1997) noted that faculty have a tendency to focus more on teaching “the logic, language, and literature of their own specializations than on broader questions of human values and moral obligations” (p. 48).

Caputo (2005) stated third obstacle: developing relationships with the off-campus networks where students could do experiential learning. It takes significant time and money to develop these relationships, and campuses frequently do not have the resources to develop these effectively. He suggested that successful campuses employ full-time staff members, and many have full centers or departments dedicated to developing town-gown relationships. Finally, he mentioned the manner in which a campus treats the idea of civic engagement. If it is not set up as a core value of the institution, it will be treated as “the academic idea du jour” (p. 6) and, therefore will not last.
Additionally, Caputo (2005) discussed six variables that he believed would affect the future of civic engagement in higher education. First, is the amount of funding these programs receive. As mentioned earlier, it takes a significant amount of money to develop civic engagement programs. With higher education funding getting tighter each year, it is more and more difficult to find money for new programs. Ward (1996) found funding to be one of the top concerns by faculty, administrators, and staff alike. Without funding for staff, transportation, basic office maintenance, and other essential items, civic engagement programs cannot be successful on a campus-wide level.

The second variable according to Caputo (2005) is the relationship between civic engagement and institutional leadership. Without this support, these programs will struggle and often fail. Third, student desire has a tendency to direct campus programming and mission. If the student desire moves away from civic engagement, it may be difficult to justify the need for civic education to stakeholders. Fourth, is dependent upon the relationship between the campus and the off-campus organizations that students are partnered with for service-learning and other civic engagement programs. If these organizations steer away from the programs or the institution, it makes it extremely difficult for the institution to develop partnerships. Fifth, is the level of support for civic engagement among the general society and in politics. Funding and justification for programs is influenced heavily by the level of support from these off-campus entities; therefore, the importance of civic engagement needs to be stressed to the public. Finally, there is a need for specific research that shows the validity of civic engagement education. At the time of this writing there is little empirical research,
especially longitudinal research, depicting the results of civic engagement, positive or negative.

Hollister et al. (2008) also addressed a few of the challenges they see facing civic education in higher education. While student support for civic engagement has risen from 17% in 1990 to 27% in 2007, students still place higher importance on earning degrees that will benefit them financially after graduation and therefore, desire academic learning geared toward that goal. This is supported by Colby et al. (2003) with their findings that many students view general education courses and courses with civic engagement connections, as “hurdles to get over on the way to preparing for that career” (p. 41).

Another factor Hollister et al. (2008) found was that faculty support is often difficult to obtain, as many faculty feel that education focused on civic engagement, i.e. service-learning and other community service related curriculum, is “academically inferior.” There is also a concern that by teaching civic engagement, institutions will ultimately promote liberal agendas rather than supporting critical thinking and other educational goals. Additionally, very few institutions offer any incentives or rewards for faculty and staff that make the time and effort to develop and teach civic education. Finally, Sax (1997) noted that while faculty might verbally support the concept of civic engagement education, they are less likely to actually facilitate it - often because they do not fully understand the appropriate pedagogies or how to implement them into the current curriculum.

Ehrlich (1999) found similar challenges to developing civic education programs and courses. Initially developing these types of courses takes a significant amount of
time and effort; typically much more than developing a traditional lecture course. In addition to the time it takes to develop the course, it typically takes more time on behalf of the faculty instructor to maintain and facilitate the course. Ehrlich found that many faculty are unsure of the time requirements and therefore, do not initiative service-learning in their curriculum.

One of the biggest problems Ehrlich (1999) found was that while students are often interested in new and different courses, they frequently shy away from them because they are afraid they will not have the time to devote to the course, or they are not sure what to really expect from it. Lastly, while academic departments often verbally support civically-engaged courses, they do not allow room for them to be included in the required curriculum; therefore, the courses are not viewed seriously by students or faculty.

A final obstacle facing civic engagement development is the “commercialization of higher education” (Colby et al., 2003, p. 12). According to these scholars, higher education has become focused on material aspects rather than missions of learning and developing moral citizens. While some of this is unavoidable due to decreasing federal and state funding, universities are spending more and more time seeking corporate sponsorships to benefit the campus. This outside, corporate funding is used to provide research grants, technologically up-to-date facilities, specialized student programming, etc. (Colby et al., 2003; Thornton & Jaeger, 2006). Colby et al. argue that while this funding provides new opportunities for campuses, it also sends a message of materialism to the student body, and sometimes even takes away time and focus on the things that promote civic engagement. Newman et al. (2004) also believe higher education has
moved in a negative direction from its initial mission. They felt that the pressures in the market and the relationship between the business world and higher education have created a situation that puts emphasis on private gain rather than public gain.

*Civic Engagement: Programs and Pedagogies*

The majority of research related to civic engagement focused on the various types of programs and pedagogies being used at different campuses. Much of the research available used case-study approaches, rather than quantitative methods of research. This section highlighted the major discussions and case-study findings related to specific programs or pedagogies in the research.

Ehrlich (1997) provided simple definitions for the three primary civic engagement pedagogies; service-learning, problem-based learning, and collaborative learning. Service-learning hinges upon going outside the walls of the institution to serve the community in some form. It also requires student reflection on what they did and how it related to their classroom learning. Sax (1997) elaborated on this farther, noting that service-learning is more than merely volunteering or doing community service. It must “relate community service to the course material and require that students reflect on their experiences…” (p. 26).

Problem-based learning is explained simply as having students create solutions to problems, preferably related to the basic course material. To create a collaborative learning situation, students should be allowed to work with other students, as well as with faculty, on projects related to their course material. While problem-based learning and collaborative learning are not limited to civic engagement education, they can be easily
tied to civic engagement through the types of problems or projects they are assigned (Ehrlich, 1999).

Ehrlich (1999) believed that civic education would be most effective if it combined the predominate pedagogy of service-learning with two other pedagogies to allow for critical thinking and connection between classroom learning and so-called “real world” problems. According to Ehrlich, it takes more than being socially and politically aware to be civically engaged. It requires citizens to identify problems at a variety of levels, and to be able to develop solutions for them.

Hunter and Brisbin (2000) sought to provide insight as to the effectiveness of service-learning on students’ perceptions of government and their participation in civic matters. The study used a pretest/post-test format, evaluating students at three different institutions in West Virginia over two semesters. The courses varied in the expectation of student service, from it being a required part of the course, to it being completely voluntary and not specifically related to the completion of the course.

The results of the assessment indicated that students overall enjoyed participating in service-learning, but that the courses where the service was completed by the students and the faculty, and courses with service-related classroom discussion, were most successful in developing student understanding of civic issues. Additionally, students who had the option of participating in service seemed to gain more from the experience in all areas of evaluation than students who were required to participate in service as part of the course. Suggestions for enhanced civic learning through service focused on the role of the faculty member to provide specific discussion and class evaluation of the service projects and how they relate to the course material (Hunter & Brisbin, 2000).
Optimally, an instructor would choose topics and problems that would help students use their classroom instruction to benefit something in their community or on their campus. This type of learning aids students in drawing connections between intellectual learning and practical application. Ehrlich (1999) felt that students would benefit most by combining all three of these pedagogies; and therefore, developed a course that took students into the San Francisco community to create solutions to the issue of welfare reform. The course required students to work with their fellow students, faculty, and community members to develop plausible solutions. Based upon student reflection and course surveys, this style of learning was successful in developing a sense of civic engagement in the participating students.

Cohen and Kinsey (1994) conducted a study on the effects of service-learning through a mass communication and society course. They sought to show that through service-learning, students in the course would learn how their knowledge of mass communication theories could benefit society, and that the students would gain a better understanding of the curriculum. Students were allowed to choose between the group service-learning project and an individual library project in order to avoid forced volunteerism. Those that continued with the group service-learning project were divided into smaller groups and given various projects. Some groups had hands-on projects that took them out into the community, while others had non-experiential projects where they stayed on campus, working on projects that would be beneficial to the community without actual contact.

The results showed that most of the students and assistants believed that the community projects (in class and out of class) were more useful than other assignments in
developing understanding of the material. Additionally, respondents said that the project created a strong connection between the material and its use in the real world. Cohen and Kinsey (1994) determined that service-learning has a positive effect on curriculum understanding, but recognized that the experiment was limited, making it difficult to draw wide-spread conclusions.

Bringle and Hatcher (1996) provided an overview of the CAPSL (Comprehensive Action Plan for Service-Learning) model which was set up as a guide for campuses developing service-learning programs. The model focused on the constituencies that would be affected by this pedagogy: institution, faculty, students, and community. For each constituency, the model provided a table of example activities to create a strategic plan for a full service-learning program (Appendix B). The model was not detail specific in order to allow for the variances of each institution.

Hollister et al. (2008) presented a case-study example for civic engagement at Tufts University. Through a generous donation to the campus, Tufts created the Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service to further student development through civic education for “lifetimes of active citizenship” (p. 20). The Tisch College has been elevated to the status of a full college at the university and supports the entire campus in developing civic engagement opportunities.

One particularly successful program for this college has been a faculty fellow program, wherein faculty members are granted a two-year, part-time appointment to develop curriculum and research for the different colleges at the university. The initiatives have crossed into both undergraduate and graduate programs, as well as multiple academic programs. Additionally, the university provost and the Tisch College
dean support specific courses being taught by practitioners from the community who are able to impart practical experience for civic engagement.

The Tisch College does not rely solely on the efforts of their faculty; they engage students, alumni, and top-level administrators as well. A student program that has proven successful is their Citizenship and Public Service Scholars program. This program trains 80 students a year in civic leadership, to act as organizers and peer-mentors to enhance civic development among the student body. Additionally, involving alumni has not only helped graduates stay connected to their alma mater, it has allowed alumni a chance to give back to their college community. Alumni have raised money for service internships, offered mentorship opportunities, provided career advice for those looking at public service, and much more. Top-level administrators have demonstrated the importance the university puts on civic engagement and education through active visual and physical support. Each year the president selects individual students to receive a special civic leadership award. Additionally, active citizenship is listed as one of the university’s three strategic vision themes.

Aronson and Webster (2007) examined the Engagement Ladder Model (Appendix C) at The Pennsylvania State University as a case-study for developing an engaged university on a land-grant campus. The model utilized a 5 step process to develop the Ladder to Engagement: strategic vision, organization for engagement, faculty buy-in, student empowerment, and community partnering. Penn State, as a land-grant institution, was viewed as “climbing the ladder toward full engagement” (p. 267), meaning that all university stakeholders were involved in the engagement mission of the institution.
While Aronson and Webster (2007) found that each step on the ladder was important to the overall success of the civic engagement mission, they noted two that held special significance; strategic vision and faculty buy-in. At the time of their study, Penn State’s president Graham Spanier had been a passionate supporter of the reinstatement of civic engagement at land-grant institutions. His strategic vision combined the different missions typically seen dividing a campus vision to develop civic engagement. “By uniting the teaching, research, and service missions to inform and invigorate one another, existing gaps among research, practices, and policies can be bridged” (p. 267).

The other primary factor cited by this case study was faculty buy-in. Penn State’s faculty members demonstrated similar attitudes to those of many of their colleagues regarding civic engagement education. Many faculty understand the value in civic engagement education, but if they do not feel appreciated and respected for the extra work, they will not participate (Aronson & Webster, 2007; Colby et al., 2003; Zlotkowski & Williams, 2003).

According to Fahey and Landow (2005) much of the time, developing civic engagement education is considered the responsibility of the education system, with the surrounding communities acting only as a contracted partner. Mike Fahey, City of Omaha mayor from 2001 to 2009, saw the potentials of civic engagement education from a different perspective. “My view at the time was intuitive: the universities housed many intelligent, well-educated people with expertise in hundreds of areas. How could we harness that public-spirited expertise and use it to the advantage of our city?” (p. 55).
Fahay and Landow (2005) provided several examples of projects that had been developed as collaborations between the city of Omaha and the various higher education institutions in their area. By partnering with the different campuses, the city was able to meet greater needs in their community and address a wider variety of projects. They found that the partnership between higher education and city governance offered opportunities for the “creation of extraordinary community-based service-learning opportunities for students that go beyond traditional programs such as internships and classroom-generated community projects” (p. 59).

Civic engagement programs vary in vast degrees in practice and philosophy. While most programs have placed their focus on developing engaged citizens, in the past few years, a new philosophy in the intent of civic engagement education has developed. The Bringing Theory to Practice (BTtoP) project, funded by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, and the Charles Engelhard Foundation of New York, takes civic engagement to a different level that any other program in the field (Checkoway, 2007; Flores, Crosby-Currie, & Zimmerman, 2007; Swaner & Finley, 2007). The BTtoP program used the idea that students who are experiencing certain levels of depression could be helped by becoming engaged in their campus and community. With disclaimers that the program would not be suitable for all students, particularly those in need of clinical care, it took the belief that higher education institutions have a responsibility for developing the whole student; mental, well-being, and civic development. The primary assumption was that if efforts for engaged learning “truly engage students and increase active involvement in learning on campus and in the community, then the program has
the potential to promote the mental health of students and to contribute to their civic development” (Checkoway, 2007, p. 6).

Seven institutions were selected to participate in the pilot program of the BTtoP. The pilot program included over 3,000 students from the seven campuses and preliminary data showed a connection between engaged learning and personal insight and satisfaction. Additionally, initial findings indicated positive outcomes for mental health.

Swaner and Finley (2007) used a mixed methods approach to study the outcomes of the BTtoP project. Because the project took place at seven campus sites and addressed three areas (engaged learning, student mental health and well being, and civic development), the researchers used the grand-design approach to be able to draw conclusions on both institutional levels and cross-site levels. The study included 2,545 students, selected randomly from the participants across all seven campuses.

The primary results relating to civic development and engaged learning showed that students felt that engaged learning lead to deeper overall learning, that they had experienced a personal transformation, and that they had high satisfaction with the engaged learning process. Regarding mental health, results indicated that student involvement correlated with lower alcohol usage, but also correlated with higher levels of stress. Additionally, most campuses felt that the results of how involvement affected depression were inconclusive and that more research was needed, specifically in relation to gender and depression.

Civic Engagement: Strategies

Given the vast array of programs and pedagogies surrounding civic engagement, it is difficult to find a single set of prescribed guidelines for developing and maintaining
successful civic engagement. The following is a collection of some of the various strategies and recommendations for developing civic engagement in higher education.

After determining the driving forces for civic engagement, Ostrander (2004) choose five colleges and universities to make 2-day visits, performing interviews among all levels of administration, faculty, staff, and students. She also spent time interviewing off-campus partners and reviewing documents on each campus.

The study produced four key findings. First, all college and university campuses have varied and dynamic emphases for civic engagement dependent upon the changing needs of the campus and community. Second, the degree of success for civic engagement is directly linked to the willingness for change and commitment to civic engagement both within the campus and community partners. Third, for civic engagement to become a part of a campus’ culture, it must be intellectually based and have the backing of the faculty. Finally, the relationship between the university and the surrounding community must be strong for civic engagement to thrive on a college campus.

Ostrander’s (2004) research suggested that civic engagement might best be practiced under a specific developmental framework, rather than using the current methods of individualized models and best practices; however, she did not provide a set framework within her study. Her findings suggested the need for further study to develop the framework, starting with the relationships between local partners, community situations, and the current campus emphasis regarding civic engagement.

As demonstrated throughout the research, how civic engagement and civic education are developed varies from scholar-to-scholar, campus-to-campus, and course-to-course. Caputo (2005) recognized the variance and determined the primary reason for
the differences is the lack of consensus on the desired outcomes. Therefore, he proposed that educators examine the civic engagement debate by first asking “what the desired outcome is” (p. 3). Caputo provided a variety of options for desired outcomes from civic education. The course curriculum and emphasis of the institution would therefore depend upon the desired outcome. Two things that Caputo (2005), believed should be common requirements were (1) an emphasis on civic engagement in the curriculum throughout the duration of a student’s tenure at an institution, and (2) a focus on providing opportunities for applied learning to take place. He additionally brought up the debate that college students should be required to participate in a national service program to provide a broader perspective.

Boyte (2008) offered the argument that regardless of desired outcomes, the results would be fruitless unless the institution, as a whole, was engaged. He contended that current civic education varies greatly between the high school and college years. In high school, civic education equates to knowledge about government, while in college, civic education is more about learning and developing values and making the connection between academic knowledge and practical usage.

He pushed for the focus to be more on being engaged institutions, rather than on having civic engagement programs. He used program examples such as Public Achievement and the American Democracy Project to demonstrate the current civic engagement activities on college campuses, and claimed that while programs such as these are key parts to civic education, they are not enough to make significant change. For a campus to develop engaged citizens, it must make efforts for civic engagement to be a “way of life” (p. 14) as it is defined on the campus of Colgate University.
Weinberg (2005) shared an example of how civic engagement took place at
Colgate University. The first thing the institution did was to assess its status regarding
civic engagement. It desired to move from a campus that did civic engagement to a
campus that was civically engaged. The campus initially focused on student affairs since
that is where most civic engagement programming took place. The university started an
initiative called Residential Education that included almost all areas of student affairs
programming. The concept was that students enrolled in the university are residents of
the campus community, whether they physically lived on campus or not. Once the
Residential Education initiative took hold, the campus began to focus on other efforts to
create civic engagement. Staff and faculty created opportunities to combine objectives
and programs. Weinberg made special note that these changes took constant work and
effort, but that the university had seen positive moves toward building a civically
engaged institution.

Thornton and Jaeger (2006) created a list of suggested guidelines for institutions
desiring to develop engaged campuses, based off a case study at a research university.
While they recognized that a case study does not provide enough research to support
widespread practice, they felt that the following guidelines could be used at any
institution to better instill civic responsibility as an institutional mission. First, a campus
must acknowledge its cultural tools and determine how they can relate to civic
responsibility. Second, a campus should include civic responsibility expectations in all
institutional material. Third, a campus should include all campus constituents
(administrators, faculty, and staff) to produce a more holistic approach to the
development of civic engagement. Lastly, a campus should recognize and encourage student leadership and involvement in the development process.

Bucher and Patton (2004) provided an overview of the educational mission of Ernest Boyer, the man often considered the champion of civic education in higher learning. They applied the lessons of Boyer to the current situations facing American colleges and universities. Boyer has been noted for his educational policy ideas, particularly those that support his belief that for education to be effective, it “needed to be built on a coherent set of values and a purposeful search for knowledge” (p. 2). Boyer fought for the development of civic engagement programs on college campuses, believing that through such programs, students would develop a set of values to take with them into their communities to help others. In addition to his push for civic engagement programs, Boyer realized that colleges and universities needed to have incentives for faculty to be engaged citizens and serve as examples for their students. His 1990 book, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, pushes the need for new faculty reward structures that include engagement and integration (Bucher & Patton, 2004).

Bucher and Patton (2004), conclude that Boyer set basic principles for civic education to be the driving force of higher education learning, but that most colleges and universities “separate mission, curriculum, and civic engagement” (p. 6), thereby choosing mission or curriculum as the institutional focus and often leaving civic engagement as the leftover responsibility of student affairs. They conclude that “the curriculum fulfills its role when the perspectives of those who teach and learn find their work meaningful and enjoyable; that is, humanizing for all” (p.7).
After examining successful institutions, Hollister et al. (2008) presented a 15-point strategy for developing and maintaining successful civic engagement.

1. Civic engagement must be defined broadly to avoid influencing political participation toward any particular party affiliation.

2. Political participation needs to be encouraged and taught across all disciplines.

3. Civic engagement should be used to bridge the gap between academic and student affairs.

4. Institutions need to take the time to analyze and evaluate what students learn though extra-curricular activities.

5. Institutions need to find ways to demonstrate how civic education enhances a student’s overall education.

6. Institutions need to ensure that all constituencies are involved in the process and allow both top-down and bottom-up leadership to take place.

7. Institutions need to use the influential power of “student produced news and information” (p. 20) to unite constituencies.

8. Efforts need to be combined across campuses to bring together engaged students and build an engaged culture.

9. Institutions need to research what is happening with civic engagement, especially among youth.

10. Institutions need to encourage both international and global civic engagement.

11. Institutions should not rely on individual programming, but rather strive to integrate civic engagement into the overall campus climate.
12. Institutions need to develop ways to measure learning outcomes to both, determine effectiveness and to add to civic engagement research.

13. Institutions should ensure that institutional politics and practices are consistent with each other and not in contradiction.

14. Institutions need to find and utilize public support for civic engagement, including financial aid programs and national service funding.

15. Institutions should research graduates’ civic engagement and find ways to support continued engagement after graduation.

The Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities created a report in 1999 focused on the engaged institution. They defined engagement as “institutions that have redesigned their teaching, research, and extension and service functions to become even more sympathetically and productively involved with their communities” (p. 9). The Commission identified seven characteristics to define an engaged institution called the Seven-Part Test; responsiveness, respect for partners, academic neutrality, accessibility, integrating engagement into institutional mission, coordination, and resource adequacy (Appendix D). Additionally, they uncovered seven common themes among the campuses that passed the Seven-Part Test. The themes represented both challenges and guidelines that engaged institutions use to shape their engagement initiatives. The themes included commitment to engagement, integration of engagement into curriculum, variety in the approach to engagement, variety in the definition of community, leadership, funding, and accountability. The themes indicated the need for institutions to have a clear commitment to the idea of engagement, and that it should be demonstrated through the curriculum and teaching mission. Given the varied
natures of individual campuses, the approaches to engagement activities and the manner in which engagement is combined with the community would differ from campus to campus. The Commission also highlighted the importance of leadership in the development of engagement, stating that “engagement will not develop by itself” (p. 11). The issues of funding and accountability were also listed as consistent themes for civic engagement. Funding was addressed as a constant concern, as the amount of funding is diminishing and the need for funding, particularly for special programs like civic engagement initiatives, is increasing. The authors of the report felt that accountability was a concern in the aspect that it needs to be placed on the correct constituents and have a rewards structure attached to it.

In light of these themes, the Commission made five primary recommendations for institutions wishing to become engaged universities. Institutions need to make service and engagement part of their institutional missions, develop their own engagement plan using the Seven-Part Test as their measurement tool, promote interdisciplinary efforts in teaching and research, have leaders who will create incentives for faculty, and have leaders who will develop secure funding for engagement initiatives (Kellogg Commission, 1999). They felt that institutions adapting these five recommendations would find higher success in campus-wide engagement.

Additionally, the Commission (1999) explained that institutions wishing to become engaged universities need to hold themselves to higher standards. They created a definition for which institutions should measure their efforts by: “two-way partnerships, reciprocal relationships between university and community, defined by mutual respect for the strengths of each” (p. 46).
Section II: Leadership in Higher Education

Leadership is broadly defined in relation to higher education. That broad definition not only causes problems for accurately defining leadership responsibilities, but it also contributes to the lack of consistency in civic engagement in higher education (Ward, 1996; Colby et. al., 2003; McGovern, Foster, & Ward, 2002). This section looked at research specifically related to presidential leadership, but during the research process, several accounts of other levels of leadership within higher education were uncovered. Therefore, the section was extended to include faculty leadership, student affairs leadership, and outside organizational leadership in regards to civic engagement.

Presidential

McGovern et al. (2002) discussed the shift in presidential leadership from the start of American higher education to the present day. The role of president has evolved from clergymen whose primary responsibility was to teach and perform some minor administrative duties, to holding the administrative leadership and authority. McGovern et al. defined the modern role of the university president by identifying the responsibilities of the position. They narrowed the responsibilities to three primary roles:

1. reflecting upon and articulating the institutional values, goals, and mission;
2. acting as a local and regional community leader on issues affecting society;
3. contributing, as a professional educational leader, to the national conversation on the present and future state of higher education (p. 30).

These responsibilities reflect the changes in the American society and demonstrate the wide-range of obstacles and challenges that university presidents face. Nelson (2002) supported the idea there are a myriad of issues that a president must address, and called for presidents to lead their institutions through each issue. “The shape of American democracy is changing and our university campuses and their presidents will be the first
frontier of that change” (p. 13). According to Nelson the president sets the institutional tone and mission, and is responsible for seeing that is carried out across campus.

The 2007 American College President study, published by the American Council on Education (King & Gomez), reviewed some of the recent trends of college and university presidents. A few of the most notable trends follow:

1. The average age of a president is older than in previous years. Since the average age in 2006 was 60 years old, it stands to reason that there will be a series of top-level turnovers in the coming years, thereby affecting the scope and nature of university missions.

2. Presidents have been serving longer terms than they were ten years prior (on average 8.5 years in 2006). This is considered a positive move for effective leadership as presidents are able to be at an institution long enough to get through the transition stage and initiate lasting change.

3. While up from 1986, fewer presidents are being selected from previous presidential positions. The most common transition is for a chief academic officer to become a campus president. The implication for this is that there is a larger learning curve once in office and, therefore; a longer time of transition for those who have not held a presidential position previously.

Nelson (2007) argued that presidents should be the primary leader of an institution; not merely in providing a vision for the institution, but through upholding the historical general creed for any institution of higher education:

…freedom of thought and inquiry, freedom of academic and scholarly expression, respect for divergent and diverse opinions, commitment to civility in discourse and behavior, belief that education passes the best of culture from one
generation to another, belief in human equality and progress, and belief in the
tenets of meritocracy (p. 30).

This type of leadership described by Nelson requires presidents to create a balance within
the institution so that the purpose of the higher education is not swayed by current and
popular trends; rather it is able to educate students with the necessary skills for work and
citizenship.

McGovern et al. (2002) examined the written and verbal rhetoric of 32 university
presidents to assess what presidents see as the current trends in higher education
leadership. One of the trends that showed in the rhetoric was the concept of teaching
leadership. The president of Colorado State University, Albert Yates, commented that
presidents have a primary responsibility to ensure that students are taught to connect
learning with leadership that will benefit society. He felt that the unique aspects of a
president’s position allow him or her to “make real their institution’s mission to prepare
future leaders” (p. 35). Another trend found in the research was the concept of civic
engagement. The study found several presidents that espoused a belief in building strong
relationships between university campuses and their surrounding communities. Many
viewed this relationship as a beneficial situation for both parties and felt that through this
relationship, students have more opportunities to learn leadership and other skills that
will help them be engaged in their communities after graduation.

Colby et al. (2003) argue that for civic engagement education to be successful on
a university campus, it must be supported through both philosophy and resources by the
upper levels of administration. The authors point out that this support must take place
from both academic and student affairs in order to create an engaged campus. Their book

_Educating Citizens: Preparing America’s Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic_
Responsibility, examined 12 campuses that had been identified as strong examples of civically engaged institutions. Through those case study examples, good presidential leadership was found as a common trend. Upper level leadership was found to be critical in the form of support and resources. “Presidential support for the agenda is critical, and in some cases it has been a visionary president to lead the development of a campus-wide program of moral and civic education” (p. 72).

Sax (1997) commented that for successful civic engagement to take place, a campus must make it part of the institutional mission, thereby placing the responsibilities of motivation and vision for civic engagement on presidents. Sax also supported the idea of developing a campus center for engagement. “A verbal, as well as financial commitment, to these centers by campus leadership helps send a message to students, faculty, staff, alumni, and the community at large that the institutions values and encourages service” (p. 32).

Similarly, Ward (1996) found presidential leadership and support to be a recurring theme in the responses to interviews she conducted to determine effective strategies. “Presidential support has been essential to the introduction of service on all the campuses” (p. 20). Big Valley State College in Montana has a “mission statement that specifically calls for incorporating community service into the curriculum” (p.19). Interviews with students confirmed the chancellor’s claim of the importance of service to the institution. The chancellor has fought to provide funding and faculty rewards to ensure that the institution upholds its service mission. While some felt that more funding is needed, there is clear support for the agenda. Ward commented that while presidential leadership and support is essential, how it is articulated is just as important. “Service
needs to be translated to stakeholders in a way that articulates the usefulness it has for realizing institutional goals for effective teaching, relevant research, and engaged public service” (p.25).

The Kellogg Commission (1999) also found leadership to be a primary theme for effective civic engagement development. They felt that without strong leadership, special initiatives such as civic engagement will remain as isolated programs rather than an institutional mission. Without purposeful leadership from presidents and other upper-level administrators, campus constituents, such as faculty, will not actively embrace engagement efforts; rather they will continue to focus on the pressing bustle of their day-to-day work; teaching and research. The Commission stated that “…engaging the university requires a particular form of academic leadership…who are open to new ideas, eager to hear new voices, and comfortable amidst the often-conflicting demands of different community partners” (p. 43).

Institutional commitment to civic engagement typically starts with the president and most frequently manifests itself in the form of programmatic support and procedural changes that impact the mission and practice of civic engagement. Once the president has determined that civic engagement will be an institutional mission, the campus must then promote the concept through a myriad of avenues; mottos, images, recognizable individuals who support the mission, etc. (Thornton & Jaeger, 2006).

Campus Compact conducts a membership survey every year, examining a multitude of areas that contribute to the development of civic engagement. The 2007 results included 550 of Campus Compact’s 1,144 institution membership, giving a response rate of 48%. Campus Compact has determined eight factors to be strong
indicators of the level of presidential commitment to civic engagement initiatives at an institution: fiscal support, participation in campus events, service on community boards, relationships with alumni and trustees, speaking or writing about service and/or civic engagement, relationships with community partners, solicitation of support from a variety of sources, and attendance at service and/or civic engagement conferences. The survey found that of the responding campuses: 78% said the president provides fiscal support for civic engagement; 77% said the president participates in campus events; 68% said the president serves on community boards; 59% said the president speaks to alumni and trustees; 52% said the president speaks or writes on service and/or civic engagement; 52% said the president meets regularly with community partners; 44% said the president solicits foundation or other support and; 39% said the president attends service and/or civic engagement conferences (Campus Compact, 2008). These statistics seemingly indicate that presidential involvement and support benefits civic engagement development at institutions of higher education.

While most civic engagement research indicates that presidential leadership is necessary to build lasting civic engagement throughout an institution, presidents are frequently pressured to focus their energies on other areas. Martin and Samels (2004) stated that the top five pressures presidents face are: to raise money, to do more with less, to make decisions regarding distance education, to find innovative ways to compete with an increasing number of for-profit institutions, and to overcome de-professionalization. Having to focus on these goals does not allow time for presidents to explore new initiatives such as civic engagement.

Faculty
It is arguable that faculty buy-in and participation is equally important to presidential leadership for the development of civic engagement on a campus. The research addressed the fact that without faculty involvement, civic engagement would not take a strong hold on a university campus (Colby et al., 2003, Caputo, 2005). Colby et al. found that “even when presidential or center leadership played an important role, faculty leadership was absolutely essential to the implementation of curricular and even some co-curricular efforts” (p.80).

Lucey (2002) pointed out, proper governance structures on college and university campuses led faculty to address issues particularly related to academics or faculty conduct. “Matters related to institutional mission, strategic planning, program review, and resource allocation are generally recognized as matters for the governing board and its administrative delegates” (p. 29). This would imply that presidents and other upper-level administrators should be the instigators of major campus initiatives. In due course, accountability for such major initiatives, and the overall mission and effectiveness of the institution should rest on the shoulders of the president, not the faculty or staff.

Nevertheless, it is important to include faculty and staff in the initial discussions regarding a civic engagement mission and curriculum as they would be the people to carry out the new mission.

According to Ostrander (2004) faculty must be involved in the development process from the beginning. They must value the civic engagement initiative and see both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for infusing related pedagogies into their curriculum (Ostrander, 2004; Aronson & Webster, 2007; Colby et al., 2003, Caputo, 2005, Ward, 1996). Faculty who disagree with the concept of teaching for professional benefit only
and ignoring the classical mission of education, can find solace in the concept of civic engagement. Teaching students to be responsible citizens can meet both sides of the educational debate (Ostrander, 2004). There is a direct link between civic engagement and faculty: service-learning pedagogy. Service-learning by definition attaches faculty to civic engagement because the service must be related to a course curriculum or it becomes merely community service (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996). Bringle and Hatcher also recognize that many faculty are not familiar with how to conduct service-learning or other civic engagement pedagogies; therefore, institutions have a responsibility to offer faculty development and continued support to faculty who are willing to develop these types of courses.

Ward (1996) discussed the challenges specifically facing faculty involvement in civic engagement education. Many campuses demand that their faculty members participate in active research and membership in outside organizations. These requirements, while important for furthering academic fields, frequently consume faculty members and limit their available time to develop civic engagement initiatives for their classes. Additionally, she found that a major cause for the lack of interest or participation of faculty members in service-learning is “the exclusion of faculty from initial conversations” (p. 16), which is consistent with other studies. When faculty feel left out of the decision-making process, they are less likely to devote the time and effort to developing such civic engagement initiatives. Aside from the perception of feeling left out, they often are not even fully aware of the proposed agenda for the campus.

*Student Affairs and Engagement Offices*
The development of departmental offices devoted to civic engagement programs has become a common practice for universities (Colby et al., 2003; Ward, 1996). However, on several campuses, the individual(s) responsible for civic engagement are also responsible for other initiatives or departments, providing little time to properly spend developing, coordinating, recruiting, and evaluating civic engagement (Ward, 1996).

Bringle and Hatcher (1996) pushed for the development of a centralized office dedicated to service-learning. They felt that by having an office dedicated to the civic engagement mission, the institution would be more likely to successfully develop service-learning opportunities. Given the time and effort it requires to develop relationships with community members, for an institution to effectively develop a service or civic engagement mission it must devote the necessary resources. As mentioned, faculty are frequently consumed with their current responsibilities of teaching, advising, committee service, and research; and therefore, do not have the time needed to develop new relationships with the community. Additionally, by developing a center for engagement, faculty have an on-campus resource to help them integrate civic engagement in their classrooms, and students have a resource to find out about service opportunities and learn about civic engagement.

While the argument is strong for the development of civic engagement offices, there are challenges associated with these centers. In her study of five Montana campuses, Ward (1996) examined the support for service-learning. Part of the criteria was that the campus had a service-learning administrator in place. On most campuses, this person served in a student affairs position. One of the problems with this format is
that faculty are often biased in their view of staff members. One of the responses she received with her case study said, “Faculty are very content oriented. Unless you’re in their content area, they don’t want anything to with you” (p. 15). This is a consistent problem for many university campuses. Upper-administration do not want to burden faculty with more responsibilities so they develop positions and offices devoted to civic engagement. However, once in place, the staff member frequently has difficulties recruiting faculty members because there is a barrier between faculty and staff. Eric Vest, Director of Career Services at Northwest Arkansas Community College, attested to this phenomenon. “Finding a service-learning coordinator has been difficult because we need someone who understands the programming and coordination that typically comes from a student affairs background, but we need someone the faculty will accept, meaning we need someone who has been in a faculty position as well” (2008).

Weinberg (2005) focused on the programming efforts by student affairs professionals in relation to civic engagement. His observation was that while student affairs maintains an important role in higher education, it has created a problem that prevents proper development of civic engagement.

Our fixation on service and programming has turned our campuses into miniature versions of resorts or fancy hotels. For this generation of students, the services and programming model reinforces the tendency to see entitlements when they should see responsibilities, to be focused on achievements when they should be driven by personal development, and to be over-programmed consumers of service when they should be reflective producers of educational outcomes. In this context, it is hard to do civic education (p. 32-33).

The change he proposed was to move from a limited model of programming to a model of education that crosses between student affairs and academic affairs. He felt this model would bridge the gap between the two campus divisions and create better learning
opportunities for students. To achieve their goal for student affairs to have an educational model rather than a programming model, Colgate University implemented an initiative called Residential Education, referring to the concept that all students who attend the university are residents of the campus community. They identified four “entry points” (p. 34) as the greatest opportunities for impacting civic engagement:

1. Teach democratic values and diplomacy through the residence halls.
2. Use student organizations to teach civic skills.
3. Use the Cultural Center as a “site of engagement” (p. 38)
4. Find ways to get students involved in politics.

Organizational Support

Aside from leadership provided by individuals and groups on campuses, there are a multitude of organizations outside the educational structure that support the development of civic engagement. These organizations vary in practice, but most have similar missions to encourage civic engagement by building networks and providing practical support to higher education institutions (Ward, 1996).

A major organization supporting civic engagement is Campus Compact, a non-profit organization dedicated to fostering civic engagement among college students. The model of this organization is to gather support from top-level administration (campus presidents/chancellors), to set civic engagement as an institutional priority, rather than treating it as an extra-curricular programming option (Gearan, 2005). In 1985, four university presidents formed Campus Compact to “engage other college and university presidents in fulfilling the public purposes of higher education” (p. 32). The initial goal was to have 100 presidents sign the Presidents’ Declaration on the Civic Responsibility
of Higher Education (Appendix E). At the time of this writing, Campus Compact reported a membership of over 1,100 colleges and universities (Campus Compact, 2009). For a college or university campus to join the organization, the institution’s president must sign the Presidents’ Declaration. Once done, that campus is able to receive special training, resources, and develop or join a state coalition.

There are five primary principles for Campus Compact: (1) campus presidents will advocate participation from all levels of an institution in public and community service, (2) campus presidents will speak out on public issues, (3) campus presidents will support collaboration efforts between the campus and community, (4) campus presidents will assist in developing opportunities for interaction between campus members and citizenship-building activities, and (5) campus presidents will support service-learning as a learning tool for civic responsibility (Gearan, 2005; Campus Compact, 2009).

As Gearan (2005) points out, Campus Compact does not promote partisanship. Instead, the organization pushes for “nonpartisan commitment to the community, the public, and the future of our nation” (p. 34). The rationale behind this focus is that higher education is supposed to be a place where students gather knowledge and skills that will benefit them in the workplace and in their communities. According to Gearan, the connection between education and civic engagement is an obvious one, as every discipline includes a civic dimension. “The engineer cannot plan a building without concern for public safety; the English teacher cannot teach literature without concern for literacy” (p. 34). Gearan suggested that intentionally educating students in civic engagement pedagogies is not an option in higher education, it is imperative to the overall learning process.
Campus Compact provides a variety of resources to its member institutions, including resources for institutional engagement assessments. To facilitate civic engagement measurement, assessment, and evaluation, the organization developed the Civic Engagement/Service-Learning Pyramid (Figure 1). The pyramid started with three levels of engagement: Introductory, Intermediate, and Advanced. However, as more institutions progressed into the Intermediate and Advanced levels, Campus Compact added another level to the pyramid, to better represent those institutions in the transition between Intermediate and Advanced. This new level was called the Advanced Intermediate.

In addition to the levels of engagement demonstrated by the Civic Engagement/Service-Learning Pyramid, the organization developed 13 indicators of engagement “designed to help campuses both assess their current level of engagement and create strategies to deepen their work” (Zlotkowski, et al., 2004, p. 4). Each indicator has a well-developed definition and a set of best practices based off the results of Campus Compact’s Indicators of Engagement Project. This project was limited to community colleges, but does provide a foundational framework for evaluation at any institution. According to the authors, an institution doesn’t have to have all 13 indicators, but the more it has, the more successful it will be in institutional engagement.

Ward (1996) conducted a study examining how organizational support from Campus Compact affected service-learning at 5 Montana campuses. She used case studies from campuses that were members of both the national Campus Compact and the Montana Campus Compact coalition. Her findings indicated that membership in the two compacts did influence the efforts each campus made to support service-learning, but that
as with most civic engagement, the implementation of service-learning initiatives varied greatly from campus to campus.

Project Pericles, a non-profit organization dedicated to building social responsibility through educational experiences, puts responsibility on trustees, administration, and faculty to further the commitment of civic engagement within an institution. “Individual student engagement is not sufficient; it is imperative that the institution be engaged as a way of buttressing and supporting its civic engagement efforts” (Caputo, 2005, p. 4). Although founded in 1999, Project Pericles is a small organization, with only 22 campuses listed as members. The programs and initiatives supported through this organization are more focused than those of other similar organizations. While the group still allows and encourages individualized efforts by member campuses, they support two primary programs; Civic Engagement Course Program and Debating for Democracy (Project Pericles, 2006).

The American Democracy Project (ADP) is an initiative sponsored by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). This project started in 2003 with a meeting of chief academic officers from a variety of institutions. The result of the meeting was the creation of the ADP which focused on preparing college students for “citizenship and the role of public education for the public good” (Mehaffy, 2005, p. 70). The ADP asked for presidential participation with the understanding that each would make the following commitments: (1) the president would act as a public advocate for civic engagement, (2) each campus’ chief academic officer would attend the national ADP meeting that summer, (3) that each campus would commit to the project for three years, and (4) that each campus would assess its own work. ADP, AASCU, and the
Carnegie Foundation offered support through resources and idea sharing. The project was designed to allow individual campus freedom to develop programs and initiatives that they felt would work best on their respective campus, but it was strongly recommended that each institution perform an initial assessment of what was currently being done across campus in regards to civic engagement.

Some of the ideas generated by campuses involved in the ADP were special events like Democracy Day and Civic Engagement Month. Other campuses chose to incorporate civic engagement concepts in their freshmen experience courses and other general education classes. A major collaboration with *The New York Times* created opportunities for campuses to have regular access to the newspaper and for it to be used as an educational tool in various courses. Even with the success that the ADP has seen at institutions across the nation, they understand that special projects frequently lose their appeal as new initiatives and challenges arise. Therefore, the project collaborators develop a new set of initiatives to inspire the continued growth of civic engagement at individual institutions (Mehaffy, 2005).

Chapter Summary

While there are numerous articles and books relating civic engagement, there are significant gaps in the empirical research regarding the development and impact of civic engagement and its related programs. While evidence from case studies indicates that presidential leadership and inclusive practices for all campus constituents is necessary for creating engaged campuses, there is no definitive research supporting this. Due to these gaps, institutions are left to develop individualized programming with marginal support from various campus constituents.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

Introduction to the Chapter

The purpose of this study was to assess the affect presidential leadership has on civic engagement at American public universities. The study is important to those in higher education as the literature on the topic is varied and does not provide any clear prescription for successful institutionalized civic engagement. It has been suggested in the literature that leadership is one of the key factors for success, therefore, this study sought to provide a base understanding as to the level of significance leadership has on civic engagement and what types of leadership create success.

The four research questions for this study are:

1. To what extent did presidential leadership promote civic engagement on a public university campus?

2. To what extent were civic engagement initiatives successful without top level institutional leadership?

3. To what extent did institutional leadership at any level promote civic engagement on a public university campus?

4. What types of institutional support were most effective in developing, supporting, and encouraging civic engagement on a public university campus?

To answer these questions, a comparative study using descriptive statistics, an analysis of variance (ANOVA), and a correlation was conducted comparing institutions that are members of Campus Compact and institutions that have received The Carnegie
Foundation’s Community Engagement classification. This chapter includes the following sections: Sample, Design and Data Collection, Instrument, Data Analysis, and Chapter Summary.

Sample

The study used a predefined sample, existing of institutions that have indicated some level of commitment to civic engagement. In order to create two comparison groups, the study utilized the 2010 Campus Compact membership list and the Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement classification list as of 2008. The differing nature of the institutional selection process for membership and classification provided an opportunity to assess the extent of influence presidential leadership has on civic engagement at a university. Additionally, by comparing these two groups, the study was able to examine the other types of leadership on campuses that contribute to civic engagement. The sample was further narrowed to public, 4-year or higher institutions.

Membership in Campus Compact is dependent upon an institution’s president submitting a letter of intent to join and the institution must be accredited by a regional accrediting body. Once admitted, the institution pays dues, based on the number of full-time undergraduate students (Appendix F). The actual level of civic engagement that takes place on the campus varies greatly, from those institutions with one or two classes utilizing civic engagement pedagogies, to those that have civic engagement as a primary focus for the institutional mission. In 2010, Campus Compact boasted a membership of over 1,100 institutions, consisting of two- and four-year or higher institutions, as well as both public and private institutions (Campus Compact, 2010). Given the study’s focus on public universities, the total membership of Campus Compact was not used. The
membership list was narrowed to public, four-year or higher universities (Group 1), consisting of 368 institutions.

Selection for the Carnegie classification is dependent on each institution applying for and meeting the specific engagement criteria set by the Carnegie Foundation. The Carnegie Foundation added this classification in 2006. Institutions for this study were those identified under the category: Curricular Engagement and Outreach and Partnerships. This category was an elected category in the classification system, and initially attracted 217 institutions. However, only 120 institutions were officially given the Community Engagement classification (Classification Descriptions, 2009).

Since it is more difficult to obtain the Carnegie Community Engagement classification, that group (Group 2) was considered the “model institution” group. Group 2 consisted of those institutions granted the Carnegie Community Engagement classification in 2006 and 2008. This elective classification was initiated in 2006, and because it was a new classification, Carnegie opened the application for classification on a two-year basis till 2010. After that, it will continue on the standard five-year rotation that the other classifications follow. This Carnegie classification is elective and those who apply for it must meet the requirements in one or more of the three following categories: curricular engagement, outreach and partnerships, and the combined category of curricular engagement and outreach and partnerships (Appendix G). The requirements are determined through the responses on the Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement Reporting Form (Appendix H). In 2006, 76 institutions received the classification status; 44 of those being public institutions. In 2008, 120 institutions received the classification status; 68 of those being public institutions
(Classification Descriptions, 2009). Further narrowing down the two sets to only four-year or higher institutions left a total of 100 institutions in Group 2.

There were 86 institutions that overlapped into both groups, meaning they were Campus Compact members, but had also received the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. Those institutions were used in Group 2, and removed from Group 1 to avoid duplicate responses. Therefore, the final number of institutions targeted to receive the survey for each group was: Group 1 with 282 institutions and Group 2 with 100 institutions.

**Design and Data Collection**

The research design for the study was the survey method, sent to institutions within each of the comparative groups by an internet survey. Due to the number of institutions in the study, the most logical option for data collection was the survey method, as this method “permits you to gather information from a large sample of people relatively quickly and inexpensively” (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorensen, 2006, p. 407). This method also allows the sample groups to vary in geography and demographic make-up to provide a more diverse sample for the study.

Campus Compact was consulted to gather names of the individual most responsible for civic engagement initiatives on member campuses. While this provided an excellent starting place, there were several out-of-date contacts, as well as a large number of schools that had not registered a specific individual for civic engagement initiatives. For these institutions, and the Carnegie institutions not part of Campus Compact, contacts were found through individual campus websites. This search began with campus directories, using the following terms to find an appropriate office and/or
individual: “civic engagement,” “service-learning,” and “volunteering.” If these searches did not return a result, the director of the student activities office was used as the contact. At times, the only contact suitable was an upper-level administrator (either in student affairs or academic affairs), but this position level was used only as a last resort.

Once the list of contacts was compiled, an initial notification (Appendix I) of the study was sent to all institutional representatives a week prior to the survey being sent. This was based on the concept noted by Ary et al. (2006), that prior notification of the study increases the response rate. The first email with the survey link included was sent out in June 2010, resulting in responses from 74 total institutions. A second email request was sent a week later bringing the total of responses to 98 institutions. A third and final email was sent the first week of July, resulting in a final total of 130 institutions officially completing the survey (Appendix J).

Instrument

The survey instrument (Appendix K) used in the study was guided by the 2008 Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement Reporting Form, the Campus Compact Indicators of Engagement Self-Assessment Guide for Community Colleges, and the 2009 Campus Compact Annual Membership Survey (Appendix L). The survey includes questions regarding institutional mission, presidential involvement, fiscal allocation and fundraising, faculty involvement, student involvement, staff involvement, and campus incentives. The survey questions breakdown as follows:

Question one asked about the campus personnel position most responsible for civic engagement efforts. This question was asked as a way to assess the level of importance an institution places on civic engagement. Bringle & Hatch (1996) suggested
that designating a specific office or individual to civic engagement efforts would increase
effectiveness for campus-wide engagement; therefore, the study assumed that there
would be a significant difference between Group 1 and Group 2.

Questions two-14 are focused on the civic engagement measures at each
institution. These questions cover topics such as institutional support, level of current
civic engagement efforts, perceived factors that inhibit success and perceived factors that
contribute to success.

Questions 15-20 focus on the level of importance the institution placed on civic
engagement. It was assumed that Group 1 and Group 2 would differ greatly in the
institutional importance they place on civic engagement through the manner in which
they promote and fund the concept.

Question 21 was broken into 18 sub-questions rated on a Likert Scale of 1-7.
These questions dealt primarily with perceptions of how the president and other top-level
administrators demonstrate support for civic engagement on their respective campuses.

The final question, Question 22, asked the responder to rank order what the most
important variable for successful civic engagement on their campus. It was assumed that
Group 1 and Group 2 would show significant differences between their responses.

In order to meet the requirements of validity and reliability, the questions on the
survey were formed from three existing surveys. Using trusted surveys as the
foundational guideline for this study’s survey provided a basic groundwork for construct
validity. Additionally, the questions asked in the survey were relevant to the topic and
provided information that was useful for comparative analysis. The surveys were sent to
the individual most responsible for civic engagement initiatives on each campus. It was
assumed that by contacting individuals responsible for the civic engagement initiatives on their respective campuses, their responses would best reflect what takes place in relation to civic engagement on their campus, and that they would have a vested interest in the survey. To address the issue of internal validity an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and a correlation were run to determine whether or not there was a statistical significance (.10 alpha). External validity was ensured by the geographic diversity and the sample size.

Reliability will be shown through the repetition of different questions on the survey. According to Ary et al. (2006) reliability can be checked through internal consistency - repeating or rephrasing the same topic in the survey – and using established surveys as the foundational basis.

Data Analysis

A range of descriptive statistics were used to provide a statistical basis for the study. Additionally, since an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is useful in comparing two sets of data, ANOVAs were conducted to compare Group 1 and Group 2 (.10 alpha). It was expected that there would be a statistically significant difference between Group 1 and Group 2 in each area. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficient (Pearson’s r) (.10 alpha) was conducted to determine significance between success and top-level leadership.

In order to answer each of the research questions for the study, the survey instrument addressed different areas of civic engagement on campuses, primarily related to presidential leadership and support, but not limited to that issue. The following shows which of the survey questions were used to answer each research question.
Research Question 1: To what extent did presidential leadership promote civic engagement on a public university campus?

Using the Campus Compact 13 Indicators of Engagement as a tool to determine what should be done on a higher education campus, it was decided that presidential leadership would be indicated by a number of factors, including: support of office and personnel dedicated to civic engagement, perceived support by the president, support demonstrated through hiring and promotion methods. To answer this research question, survey questions one, two, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21A, 21B, 21C, 21D, 21E, 21F, 21G, 21H, 21Q, and 21R were analyzed for differences between the two groups. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data, including percentages, frequencies, means, and standard deviations. In order to demonstrate significance between Group 1 and Group 2, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) (.10 alpha) was conducted on the Likert-scale questions and another was conducted using questions two and 21R.

Research Question 2: To what extent were civic engagement initiatives successful without top level institutional leadership?

This question will be answered using the information from survey questions two, 21A, 21B, 21C, 21D, 21E, 21F, 21G, 21H and 21R. Survey questions number two and 21R were used as the base for this question as they asked the responder to indicate the level of success for civic engagement initiatives on their campus. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficient (Pearson’s r) (.10 alpha) was conducted between the combined score of questions two and 21R and the Likert-scale questions related to presidential leadership (21A-21H) to assess the extent that leadership has on civic engagement on a public university campus.
Research Question 3: To what extent did institutional leadership at any level promote civic engagement on a public university campus?

This question was answered using the information from survey questions three, four, 17, 21I, 21J, 21K, 21N, 21O. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data including percentages, means, frequencies, and standard deviations. An ANOVA was used to compare Group 1 and Group 2 on the Likert-scale questions to draw a conclusion about the impact of broad leadership on civic engagement efforts.

Research Question 4: What types of institutional practices were most effective in developing, supporting, and encouraging civic engagement on a public university campus?

This question was answered using the responses from survey questions three, four, five, six, seven, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21L, 21M, 21P, 21Q, and 22. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data, including percentages, means, frequencies, and standard deviations. These statistics were used to imply inferences to the population.

Chapter Summary

The chapter explained the specifics of the study to determine and evaluate the effects of presidential leadership on civic engagement at public, four-year or higher universities. The methods in the study were designed to analyze whether or not there is any significant difference between Group 1 and Group 2. A brief review of the sample, design, data collection, instrument, and data analysis was provided. Further discussion of the methods will be covered through the results and findings discussion.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction to Chapter

Higher education in America has a strong history of civic engagement education, with the past two decades bringing a resurgence to that focus (Checkoway, 2001; Colby et al., 2003; Ehrlich, 2000; Sax, 2004; Swaner, 2007). The varied degree in which civic engagement has been incorporated on university and college campuses has contributed to diverse levels of understanding and practice. Therefore, the aim of this study was to provide an understanding of factors that contribute to successful civic engagement, primarily focusing on what affect presidential leadership has on that focus.

The current chapter provides an analysis of the study results and findings, with implications as to what these results indicate about civic engagement. The chapter contains a summary of the study, a presentation of the raw data from the survey instrument, and an analysis of the data related to the specific research questions.

Summary of Study

The concept of civic engagement has been a part of American higher education since its foundation (Lucas, 2006; Cohen, 1996; Colby et al., 2003). For the purpose of the study, civic engagement was defined as education that teaches students to “make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and motivation to make that difference” (Ehrlich, 2000, p. vi). The study examined the effect presidential leadership had on the development of civic engagement at public universities. Additionally, the study sought to identify factors that
contributed to successful civic engagement, including different levels of leadership and specific practices.

The research for the study sought to identify the driving forces for civic engagement; challenges facing civic engagement development; and programs, pedagogies, and strategies currently used for civic engagement. Additionally, the research review provided an overview of current presidential leadership, faculty and student affairs issues related to civic engagement, and a discussion of the organizations promoting the civic engagement mission. Some of the prominent forces driving the call for civic engagement were student desire for civic engagement, evidence that civic engagement education enhances student learning, and evidence that this type of education supports students’ personal, professional, ethical, and moral development (Hollister et al., 2008; Galston, 2001; Savage, 2007). Additionally, Newman et al. (2004) felt that higher education has a priority to educate and develop students to become active citizens to bridge the growing gap between public need and what a university gives back. Finally, Harward (2007) argued that higher education has been under pressure to provide actual outcome measurements. This was supported by Ostrander’s (2004) findings that the public expects higher education to produce graduates who are engaged in their communities.

Although there are a number of driving forces that encourage the development of civic engagement, there are also a multitude of challenges. Ward (1996) discussed the struggle between actual practice and institutional rhetoric. She argued that if universities can receive credit for their rhetoric concerning civic engagement, there is no incentive to put that rhetoric into practice. The involvement of faculty was another significant factor
in the development of civic engagement (Caputo, 2005; Hollister et al., 2008; Newman, 1985; Pascarella, 1997). Faculty support is often difficult to obtain, as some faculty do not see the value in civic engagement education and the amount of time it takes to develop effective civic engagement pedagogies. Additionally, there is little incentive for developing and including civic engagement in courses.

The diversity in the practice of civic engagement creates difficulty for those attempting to develop successful practices. Much of the current practice related to civic engagement has focused on community service and service-learning (Ehrlich, 1999; Sax, 1997; Hunter & Brisbin, 2000; Cohen & Kinsey, 1994; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996). However, Ehrlich (1999) discussed three civic engagement pedagogies for use in academic courses; service-learning, problem-based learning, and collaborative learning. Many institutions have started to develop special programs or departments dedicated to civic engagement initiatives from collaboration with surrounding communities to incorporating civic engagement philosophies with counseling programs (Aronson & Webster, 2007; Checkoway, 2007; Hollister et al., 2008).

There are few prescribed guidelines for developing and maintaining successful civic engagement; however, there are a variety of strategies and recommendations for developing civic engagement in higher education. The themes included commitment to civic engagement, integration of engagement across the curriculum, variety in the approach to civic engagement, effective leadership, adequate funding, and accountability. The themes indicated the need for institutions to have a clear commitment to the idea of civic engagement (Bucher & Patton, 2004; Caputo, 2005; Hollister et al., 2008; Kellogg Commission, 1999; Thornton & Jaeger, 2006; Weinberg, 2005).
The one constant variable on all campuses is an institution’s president; therefore, the factor was examined as the primary focus for the study. According to Nelson (2002) the president sets the institutional tone and mission, and is responsible for seeing that these are implemented across campus. Colby et al. (2003) argued that civic engagement education will not be successful on a university campus unless it is supported through both philosophy and resources by the upper levels of administration. Additionally, Ward (1996) found presidential leadership and support to be a recurring theme in the responses to a study to determine effective strategies. This was supported by the Kellogg Commission in 1999.

Many institutions have found it beneficial to have a common location to base their civic engagement efforts; thereby dedicating departmental offices and staff to facilitate and coordinate civic engagement initiatives (Colby et al., 2003; Ward, 1996). However, because of the division between academic affairs and student affairs, there are consistent barriers facing civic engagement practitioners to engage faculty in civic engagement philosophies and practices (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Ward, 1996.) Additionally, institutions have discovered strong resources off campus through national organizations such as Campus Compact and the American Democracy Project. These organizations vary in practice, but similar missions to encourage civic engagement by building networks and providing practical support to higher education institutions (Gearan, 2005; Mehaffy, 2005; Ward, 1996).

Survey and Data Collection

The study used a predefined sample, consisting of four-year, public institutions on the 2010 Campus Compact membership list and the Carnegie Foundation Community
Engagement classification list as of 2008. The differing nature of the institutional selection process for membership and classification provided an opportunity to assess the extent of influence presidential leadership and other types of leadership and practices on civic engagement at a university. This comparative study used descriptive statistics, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and a Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation (Pearson’s $r$) to assess the influence of presidential leadership on civic engagement on university campuses and to explain which factors can be attributed to successful civic engagement.

Membership in Campus Compact is dependent upon an institution’s president submitting a letter of intent to join. Member institutions must be accredited by a regional accrediting body and pay dues to the national office. The actual level of civic engagement that takes place on the campus varies greatly, from those institutions with one or two classes utilizing civic engagement pedagogies, to those that have civic engagement as a primary focus for the institutional mission. Given the study’s focus on public universities, the total membership of Campus Compact was not used. The membership list was narrowed to public, four-year or higher universities (Group 1), equaling 368 institutions.

Selection for the Community Engagement Carnegie classification is dependent on each institution applying for and meeting the specific engagement criteria set by the Carnegie Foundation. Since more is required to obtain the Carnegie Community Engagement classification, that group (Group 2) was considered the “model institution” group. Group 2 consisted of those institutions granted the Carnegie Community
Engagement classification in 2006 and 2008. Again, the membership list was narrowed to public, four-year or higher universities, totaling 100 institutions.

There were 86 institutions that overlapped into both test groups, meaning they were Campus Compact members, but had also received the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. Those institutions were used in Group 2, and removed from Group 1 to avoid duplication. Therefore, the final number of institutions targeted to receive the survey for each group was: Group 1 with 282 institutions and Group 2 with 100 institutions.

The research design for the study was the survey method, with a survey sent electronically to institutions within each of the comparative groups. Due to the number of institutions in the study, the most logical option for data collection was the survey method, as this method “permits you to gather information from a large sample of people relatively quickly and inexpensively” (Ary et al., 2006, p. 407). The method also allows the sample groups to vary in geography and demographic make-up to provide a more diverse sample for the study.

The survey instrument used in the study was guided by the 2008 Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement Reporting Form, the Campus Compact Indicators of Engagement Self-Assessment Guide for Community Colleges, and the 2009 Campus Compact Annual Membership Survey. Additionally, questions in the survey were guided by the different factors that emerged through the research. The survey included questions regarding institutional mission, presidential involvement, fiscal allocation and fundraising, faculty involvement, student involvement, staff involvement, and campus incentives.
Presentation of Data

This section provided a breakdown of the results from the survey questions. The first email with the survey link included was sent to the sample on June 21, 2010, to 382 institutions. This first email request resulted in responses from 74 total institutions. A second email request was sent on June 29, 2010, bringing the total of responses to 98 institutions. A third and final email was sent on July 5, 2010, resulting in a total of 155 institutions participating (response rate of 40.6%, N=155). However, only 130 institutions completed the survey in its entirety. Out of the 155 participants, 110 (n=110, 28.8%) were from Group 1, and 45 (n=45, 11.8%) were from Group 2.

The survey was presented in four sections: Institutional Information (Question 1), Civic Engagement (Questions 2-14), Institutional Support (Questions 15-20), and Scaled Questions (21-22). The first question asked the responder to identify the person most responsible for civic engagement initiatives on their respective campus. Responses were classified into four categories: Administration, Civic Engagement/Service-Learning, Student Activities, or Faculty. The “Administration” category included the following responses: President/Chancellor, Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs, and Vice President of Student Affairs. The “Civic Engagement/Service-Learning” category included the following two responses: Director/Coordinator of Civic Engagement Office and Director/Coordinator of Service-Learning. The “Student Activities” category was used for participants who marked the Director/Coordinator of Student Activities option. The “Faculty” category was used for participants who marked the Faculty Member option. There was an “Other” option, but those responses were filtered into the
appropriate category based on the exact title the participant listed. Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage of the participants from each Group.

Table 1.

*Individual Responsible for Civic Engagement Initiatives (N=147)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Campus Compact (n=106)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement/Service-Learning</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Carnegie Community Engagement (n=41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement/Service-Learning</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey questions two through 14 focused on civic engagement and various practices that take place. Question two asked campuses to rate the success level of civic engagement on their campus relative to their peer institutions. The rating scale was evaluated using the following scores: 4 = Highly Successful, 3 = Moderately Successful, 2 = Moderately Unsuccessful and 1 = Very Unsuccessful. Table 2 illustrates the mean score and standard deviation for each of the surveyed Groups.

Table 2.

*Rating of Civic Engagement Success Relative to Peer Institutions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Campus Compact (n=95)</td>
<td>3.042</td>
<td>.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Carnegie Community Engagement (n=40)</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question three asked participants to indicate what factors they felt attributed to the lack of success of civic engagement initiatives on their campus. The survey offered 12 of the most commonly mentioned factors based on the research related to civic engagement. Respondents were allowed to choose as many factors as they felt applied to the possible lack of success on their campus. An “Other” category was offered, but the responses were either not applicable to the question or filtered into one of the factors offered. Table 3 shows the frequency and percentage for each category, separated by Group.
Table 3.

Factors Attributed to Lack of Success (N=138)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1: Campus Compact (n=97)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding for CE efforts</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of presidential leadership/support for CE</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of programs &amp; initiatives focused on CE</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of organization for CE efforts</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of recognition for CE efforts (faculty, staff, &amp; student)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE efforts not included in the tenure and/or promotion process</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of CE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training on CE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty apathy toward CE</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff apathy toward CE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student apathy toward CE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding &amp; support for CE from departments</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (not filtered into factors above)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2: Carnegie Community Engagement (n=41)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding for CE efforts</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of presidential leadership/support for CE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of programs &amp; initiatives focused on CE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of organization for CE efforts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of recognition for CE efforts (faculty, staff, &amp; student)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE efforts not included in the tenure and/or promotion process</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of CE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training on CE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty apathy toward CE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff apathy toward CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student apathy toward CE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding &amp; support for CE from departments</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (not filtered into factors above)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question four asked participants to indicate the factors they felt attributed to the success of civic engagement on their respective campuses. The survey offered 12 of the most commonly mentioned factors attributed to success based on the research related to civic engagement. Respondents were limited to choosing one factor that they feel provides the greatest impact for success. An “Other” category was offered, and again, responses were either not applicable to the question or filtered into one of the factors offered. Table 4 shows the frequency and percentage for each category, separated by Group.
Table 4.

*Factor of Greatest Impact for Success (N=139)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1: Campus Compact (n=98)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for CE efforts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential leadership/support for CE efforts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific programs &amp; initiatives focused on CE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good organization for CE efforts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for CE efforts (faculty, staff, &amp; students)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE efforts included in the tenure and/or promotion process</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training opportunities on CE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good understanding of CE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty involvement in CE initiatives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff involvement in CE initiatives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student involvement in CE initiatives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from department chairs/deans for CE efforts</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (not filtered into factors above)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2: Carnegie Community Engagement (n=41)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for CE efforts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential leadership/support for CE efforts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific programs &amp; initiatives focused on CE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good organization for CE efforts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for CE efforts (faculty, staff, &amp; students)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE efforts included in the tenure and/or promotion process</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training opportunities on CE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good understanding of CE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty involvement in CE initiatives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff involvement in CE initiatives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student involvement in CE initiatives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from department chairs/deans for CE efforts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (not filtered into factors above)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question five asked campuses to rate the extent civic engagement initiatives had been integrated with curriculum at an institutional-wide level. In order to make all rated questions equal for later comparison (questions two, five, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16 18, 20, and 21A-21R), the rating scale was factored based on the highest individual score of seven since that was the highest score eligible among these questions. For question five, there were three score-able options (Not Integrated received no score), the highest individual score for the survey (seven) was divided by three (the score-able options for this question). This created a difference of 2.34. To reach each degree of difference, 2.34 was subtracted from the previous rating score. Therefore the following rating scale was used on this question: 7 = Heavily Integrated, 4.66 = Moderately Integrated, 2.32 = Partially Integrated and 0 = Not Integrated. Table 5 illustrates the mean score and standard deviation for each of the surveyed Groups.

Table 5.

*Extent of Integration of Civic Engagement with Curriculum*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Campus Compact</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Carnegie Community Engagement</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question six asked for further explanation of integration by having respondents indicate in which areas integration takes place on their campus. Respondents were asked to mark each area that applied. Table 6 shows the frequency and percentage for each area, separated by Group.
Table 6.

Areas of Integration (N=129)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1: Campus Compact (n=90)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen Year Experience programs/courses</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core curriculum courses</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate study programs/courses</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In specific majors/disciplines</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs programs/events</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2: Carnegie Community Engagement (n=39)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen Year Experience programs/courses</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core curriculum courses</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate study programs/courses</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In specific majors/disciplines</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs programs/events</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, Question seven asked what forms of civic engagement took place on individual campuses. Respondents were asked to mark all forms that applied to their campus. The question offered an “Other” option, although the responses listed in the option were related to the already offered options, and it appeared that the respondents merely wanted to explain their programs in more detail. Table 7 shows the frequency and percentage for each form of civic engagement, separated by Group.
Table 7.

*Forms of Civic Engagement on Campus (N=136)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1: Campus Compact (n=96)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus Service</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning in the Classroom</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-based Learning in the Classroom</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-Learning</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Leadership Development</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2: Carnegie Community Engagement (n=40)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus Service</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning in the Classroom</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-based Learning in the Classroom</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-Learning</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Leadership Development</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 10 asked participants to rank the level of support given by upper-administration to faculty members who were involved in civic engagement initiatives. In order to make all rated questions equal for later comparison (questions two, five, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, and 21A-21R), the rating scale was factored based on the highest individual score of seven since that was the highest score eligible among these questions. Since there were four score-able options for the question (Not Supportive At All received no score), the highest individual score for the survey (seven) was divided by four (the score-able options for this question). This created a difference of 1.75. To reach each degree of difference, 1.75 was subtracted from the previous rating score. Therefore, the rating scale for the question used the following scores: 7 = Extremely Supportive, 5.25 = Somewhat Supportive, 3.5 = Neither Supportive or Non-Supportive, 1.75 = Not Very
Supportive and 0 = Not Supportive At All. Table 8 provides an illustration of the mean score and standard deviation for each of the surveyed Groups.

Table 8.

**Upper-Administrative Support for Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Campus Compact (n=92)</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Carnegie Community Engagement (n=40)</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 11 asked participants to rank the level of support given by upper-administration to staff members who are involved in civic engagement initiatives. In order to make all rated questions equal for later comparison (questions two, five, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, and 21A-21R), the rating scale was factored based on the highest individual score of seven; as that was the highest score eligible among the questions. As there were four score-able options on this question (Not Supportive At All received no score), the highest individual score for the survey (seven) was divided by four (the score-able options for this question). This created a difference of 1.75. To reach each degree of difference, 1.75 was subtracted from the previous rating score. Therefore, the rating scale was evaluated using the following scores: 7 = Extremely Supportive, 5.25 = Somewhat Supportive, 3.5 = Neither Supportive or Non-Supportive, 1.75 = Not Very Supportive and 0 = Not Supportive At All. Table 9 provides an illustration of the mean score and standard deviation for each of the surveyed Groups.
Table 9.

Upper-Administrative Support for Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Campus Compact (n=93)</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Carnegie Community Engagement (n=39)</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 14 asked respondents whether or not their campus had an organized, systematic way to assess civic engagement. The responses were either yes or no. It was implied that having a way to assess civic engagement is a positive indicator of support, “yes” responses were given a score of seven and “no” responses were given a score of zero. Table 10 provides an illustration of the mean score and standard deviation for each of the surveyed Groups.

Table 10.

Systematic Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Campus Compact (n=92)</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>3.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Carnegie Community Engagement (n=39)</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>3.191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 15 asked respondents to indicate whether or not their institution had a mission statement that reflected civic engagement. Responses were marked either “yes” or “no”. It was implied in the research that including civic engagement in institutional mission statements is a positive indicator of support; therefore, “yes” responses were given a score of seven and “no” responses were given a score of zero. Table 11 provides an illustration of the mean score and standard deviation for each of the surveyed Groups.
Table 11.

*Civic Engagement Included in Mission Statement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Campus Compact</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>2.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((n = 90))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Carnegie Community Engagement</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>2.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((n = 39))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 16 was limited to respondents that marked “yes” in Question 15, indicating civic engagement was included in the mission statement of the institution. The question asked respondents to rate the emphasis the institution puts on the civic engagement aspect of the mission statement. In order to make all rated questions equal for later comparison (questions two, five, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, and 21A-21R), the rating scale was factored based on the highest individual score of seven since that was the highest score eligible among these questions. Since there were five score-able options on the question (Not Applicable received no score), the highest individual score for the survey (7) was divided by five (the score-able options for this question). This created a difference of 1.4. To reach each degree of difference, 1.4 was subtracted from the previous rating score. Therefore, the rating scale was evaluated using the following scores: 7 = Heavily Emphasized, 5.6 = Moderately Emphasized, 4.2 = Neither Emphasized or Not Emphasized, 2.8 = Not Emphasized Much, 1.4 = Relatively Ignored and 0 = Not Applicable (those that responded “no” to Question 15). Table 12 illustrates the mean score and standard deviation for each of the surveyed Groups.
Question 17 asked for further explanation of how civic engagement was emphasized on campus. Respondents were asked to mark each area that applied. Table 13 shows the frequency and percentage for each area, separated by Group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Emphasis</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1: Campus Compact (n=91)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus has an office devoted to CE</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE is required for graduation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement to develop service-learning courses</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding allocated for CE initiatives</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for travel to CE conferences (fac., staff, &amp; students)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosts special campus-wide programs/events promoting CE</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers courses on volunteerism, activism, and/or advocacy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides funding to students for service-related initiatives</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides room on transcripts for service records</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides training for faculty on CE pedagogies</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for faculty involved in CE</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for staff involved in CE</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for students involved in CE</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires service-learning as part of degree plans</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2: Carnegie Community Engagement (n=39)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus has an office devoted to CE</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE is required for graduation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement to develop service-learning courses</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding allocated for CE initiatives</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for travel to CE conferences (fac., staff, &amp; students)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosts special campus-wide programs/events promoting CE</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers courses on volunteerism, activism, and/or advocacy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides funding to students for service-related initiatives</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides room on transcripts for service records</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides training for faculty on CE pedagogies</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for faculty involved in CE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for staff involved in CE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for students involved in CE</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires service-learning as part of degree plans</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 18 asked respondents about the level of funding civic engagement initiatives received on their campus. Specifically, the question asked if the amount of funding was adequate to accomplish the goals of the institution regarding civic engagement. In order to make all rated questions equal for later comparison (questions two, five, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, and 21A-21R), the rating scale was factored based on
the highest individual score of seven since that was the highest score eligible among these questions. There were five score-able options on the question (No Specific Funding Allocated received no score), the highest individual score for the survey (seven) was divided by five (the score-able options for this question). This created a difference of 1.4. To reach each degree of difference, 1.4 was subtracted from the previous rating score. Therefore, the rating scale was evaluated using the following scores: 7 = Very Adequate, 5.6 = Moderately Adequate, 4.2 = Neither Adequate or Inadequate, 2.8 = Barely Adequate, 1.4 = Not Adequate At All and 0 = No Specific Funding Allocated. Table 14 provides an illustration of the mean score and standard deviation for each of the surveyed Groups.

Table 14.

*Level of Adequate Funding for Civic Engagement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Campus Compact</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Carnegie Community Engagement</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 19 asked for further information regarding how civic engagement is funded on each campus. Respondents were asked to mark all options that applied to their campus. Table 15 shows the frequency and percentage for each area, separated by Group.
Table 15.

Sources of Funding for Civic Engagement (N=130)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1: Campus Compact (n=91)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of state allocations</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of federal allocations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special donations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni giving</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community partnerships</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific funding support</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2: Carnegie Community Engagement (n=39)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of state allocations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of federal allocations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special donations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni giving</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community partnerships</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific funding support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 20 asked respondents to indicate whether or not their institution had a strategic plan that included civic engagement. Responses were marked either “yes” or “no”. It was implied that including civic engagement in organizational structures such as strategic planning is a positive indicator of support; therefore, “yes” responses were given a score of seven and “no” responses were given a score of zero. Table 16 provides an illustration of the mean score and standard deviation for each of the surveyed Groups.

Table 16.

Civic Engagement Included in Strategic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Campus Compact (n=90)</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>3.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Carnegie Community Engagement (n=39)</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>2.864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 21 asked respondents to rate 18 different statements on a Likert-scale in relation to their specific institutions. The statements included topics related to presidential leadership, vice president/dean level leadership, faculty and issues, and department and organizational structures. The Likert-scale used the following criteria: 7 = Strongly Agree; 6 = Agree; 5 = Somewhat Agree; 4 = Neutral Opinion; 3 = Somewhat Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree. Table 17 provides an illustration of the mean score and standard deviation for each of the statements, separated by Group.
Table 17.

*Ratings of Indicators of Civic Engagement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President seeks funding for CE</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.700)</td>
<td>(1.522)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President supports CE mission</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.486)</td>
<td>(1.248)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President models CE</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.762)</td>
<td>(1.462)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President recognizes faculty &amp; staff involved in CE</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.508)</td>
<td>(1.551)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President seeks to provide adequate funding for CE</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.587)</td>
<td>(1.756)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President believes in CE</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.590)</td>
<td>(1.309)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President encourages CE in academic programs</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.537)</td>
<td>(1.586)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President encourages CE in student affairs programs</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.448)</td>
<td>(1.444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPs/Deans believe in CE</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.484)</td>
<td>(1.276)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 17 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$M$ $(SD)$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$M$ $(SD)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPs/Deans support CE in academic programs</td>
<td>$n=86$</td>
<td>4.63 $(1.495)$</td>
<td>$n=38$</td>
<td>4.95 $(1.293)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPs/Deans support CE in student affairs programs</td>
<td>$n=86$</td>
<td>5.12 $(1.376)$</td>
<td>$n=38$</td>
<td>5.21 $(1.189)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty are rewarded for CE efforts</td>
<td>$n=84$</td>
<td>3.44 $(1.608)$</td>
<td>$n=37$</td>
<td>4.08 $(1.570)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff are rewarded for CE efforts</td>
<td>$n=86$</td>
<td>3.19 $(1.475)$</td>
<td>$n=38$</td>
<td>3.39 $(1.717)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus divisions work together to promote CE</td>
<td>$n=85$</td>
<td>3.88 $(1.52)$</td>
<td>$n=38$</td>
<td>4.39 $(1.59)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty believe in CE</td>
<td>$n=86$</td>
<td>4.44 $(1.261)$</td>
<td>$n=38$</td>
<td>4.71 $(0.956)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty are provided adequate training over CE</td>
<td>$n=85$</td>
<td>4.09 $(1.493)$</td>
<td>$n=38$</td>
<td>4.68 $(1.596)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution does regular assessment over CE</td>
<td>$n=85$</td>
<td>3.62 $(1.690)$</td>
<td>$n=38$</td>
<td>3.61 $(1.764)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceive institution’s CE efforts as successful</td>
<td>$n=83$</td>
<td>4.27 $(1.562)$</td>
<td>$n=38$</td>
<td>4.95 $(1.576)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 22 asked respondents to rank order which factor they believed was the most important to creating or sustaining successful civic engagement on their campus. The question had eight factors for ranking: A Civic Engagement Office; Faculty Inclusion; Faculty Recognition/Rewards; Fiscal Support/Adequate Funding; Presidential Leadership/Support; Staff Recognition/Rewards; Student Inclusion/Voice; Training and Development. Respondents were asked to rank the factors on an eight-point scale, with eight being the most important factor and one being the least. Group 1 ranked the factors in the following order: 8 (Most Important) = Fiscal Support/Adequate Funding, 7 = Presidential Leadership/Support, 6 = A Civic Engagement Office, 5 = Faculty Inclusion, 4 = Student Inclusion/Voice, 3 = Faculty Recognition/Rewards, 2 = Training and Development, 1 (Least Important) = Staff Recognition/Rewards. Group 2 ranked the factors in the following order: 8 (Most Important) = A Civic Engagement Office, 7 = Fiscal Support/Adequate Funding, 6 = Presidential Leadership/Support, 5 = Faculty Inclusion, 4 = Faculty Recognition/Rewards, 3 = Training and Development, 2 = Student Inclusion/Voice, 1 = Staff Recognition/Rewards. Table 18 provides an illustration of the frequency, percentage and mean of each factor, separated by Group.
Table 18.

**Ranked Factors Influencing Civic Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Least Important</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Freq. (%)</td>
<td>2 Freq. (%)</td>
<td>3 Freq. (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A CE office (n=85)</td>
<td>11 (12.9)</td>
<td>2 (2.4)</td>
<td>2 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty inclusion (n=82)</td>
<td>2 (2.4)</td>
<td>6 (7.3)</td>
<td>9 (11.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty recognition (n=82)</td>
<td>6 (7.3)</td>
<td>20 (24.4)</td>
<td>16 (19.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal support (n=79)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5 (6.3)</td>
<td>3 (3.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential support (n=84)</td>
<td>1 (1.2)</td>
<td>3 (3.6)</td>
<td>3 (3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff recognition (n=83)</td>
<td>33 (39.8)</td>
<td>21 (25.3)</td>
<td>14 (16.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student inclusion (n=83)</td>
<td>9 (10.8)</td>
<td>17 (20.5)</td>
<td>14 (16.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training (n=82)</td>
<td>17 (20.7)</td>
<td>9 (11.0)</td>
<td>20 (24.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Least Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Freq. (%)</td>
<td>2 Freq. (%)</td>
<td>3 Freq. (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Carnegie Community Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A CE office (n=38)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (2.6)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty inclusion (n=37)</td>
<td>1 (2.7)</td>
<td>6 (16.2)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty recognition (n=36)</td>
<td>2 (5.6)</td>
<td>6 (16.7)</td>
<td>6 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal support (n=38)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (2.6)</td>
<td>5 (13.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential support (n=37)</td>
<td>1 (2.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>7 (18.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff recognition (n=32)</td>
<td>20 (62.5)</td>
<td>11 (34.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student inclusion (n=37)</td>
<td>3 (8.1)</td>
<td>9 (24.3)</td>
<td>10 (27.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training (n=37)</td>
<td>7 (18.9)</td>
<td>3 (8.1)</td>
<td>7 (18.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions eight, nine, 12, and 13 were unusable in the study due to poor response levels and extreme variety in responses. Questions eight and nine asked about the number of hours students, faculty, and staff spent doing civic engagement activities during the past year. However, there were not enough responses to create any valid results. The responses that were collected were too varied to provide any kind of logical statistical reporting. Question 12 asked how many service-learning courses were offered on campus during the past year. Question 13 asked what the percentage of total course offerings were service-learning courses. Like Questions eight and nine, there were minimal responses, and those that did respond did not provide enough information to create any logical statistical reporting.

Data Analysis

This section provided an explanation of the data analysis for each research question. The purpose of this study was to examine presidential influence on civic engagement at public, four-year universities, so the research questions were designed to take a deeper look at what affects the potential success of civic engagement on a university campus.

Research question 1: To what extent did presidential leadership promote civic engagement on a public university campus?

To answer this research question, survey questions one, two, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21A, 21B, 21C, 21D, 21E, 21F, 21G, 21H, 21Q and 21R were analyzed for differences between the two groups. Group 1 (Campus Compact members) and Group 2 (Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement classification recipients) were used as comparison groups because of the nature of the membership in each group. Both groups
promote civic engagement in higher education, but membership into Campus Compact is a process based on presidential rhetoric of civic engagement, and attainment of the Community Engagement classification is a process based on a set of specific criteria that must be met by an institution to receive the classification through the Carnegie Foundation. Using these two groups provided a basis for comparison by using Group 2 as the model group.

As demonstrated in Table 1, both Group 1 and Group 2 placed importance on having an individual dedicated to civic engagement or service-learning (Group 1 \( n = 120, 59.4\% \) and Group 2 \( n = 41, 82.9\% \)). This indicated that presidents valued the importance of civic engagement by dedicating an individual specifically responsible for civic engagement efforts.

Survey questions two and 21R asked respondents to rate the success of their institution’s civic engagement efforts in comparison to their peer institutions. These questions were combined to create a single rating score with a range of 11. A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to compare Group 1 and Group 2 in how the two groups perceived their level of success in relation to civic engagement (alpha .10). The results of the analysis showed a significant difference between Group 1 and Group 2 in how they perceived their success, \( F (1, 119) = 5.98, p = .016 \); indicating that Group 2 institutions perceived their overall civic engagement efforts to be more successful than Group 1 institutions did.

Descriptive statistics were used on questions 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, and 21Q to analyze the data, including means and standard deviations. Table 19 illustrates the mean and standard deviation of each question, separated by Group.
Table 19.

Factors Indicating Presidential Leadership Toward Civic Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Systematic Assessment</td>
<td>n=92</td>
<td>2.28 (3.299)</td>
<td>n=39</td>
<td>1.97 (3.191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Civic Engagement Included in Mission Statement</td>
<td>n=90</td>
<td>5.52 (2.873)</td>
<td>n=39</td>
<td>5.74 (2.721)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) Emphasis on CE Focus</td>
<td>n=91</td>
<td>4.37 (2.369)</td>
<td>n=39</td>
<td>4.90 (2.462)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Level of Adequate Funding for CE</td>
<td>n=91</td>
<td>3.26 (1.783)</td>
<td>n=39</td>
<td>3.84 (1.809)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) CE Included in Strategic Plan</td>
<td>n=90</td>
<td>5.29 (3.025)</td>
<td>n=39</td>
<td>5.56 (2.864)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21Q) Institution does regular assessment over CE</td>
<td>n=85</td>
<td>3.62 (1.690)</td>
<td>n=38</td>
<td>3.61 (1.764)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine factors that were significant, the standard deviation of all scaled questions in the survey was used (Group 1: $M = 4.21$, $SD = 1.029$ and Group 2: $M = 4.61$, $SD = 1.102$). Factors that were one standard deviation above the mean (5.24 for Group 1 and 5.71 for Group 2) were considered significant. Therefore, in the questions listed in Table 20, question 15 (asking if civic engagement was included in institutional mission statements) ranked significant for both Group 1 ($M = 5.52$) and Group 2 ($M = 5.74$). The
results indicated that both groups placed a high importance on including civic engagement in the mission statement. Question 14, as listed on Table 20, scored significantly lower than the scaled questions mean (Group 1 $M = 2.28$ and Group 2 $M = 1.97$) which indicated that assessment of civic engagement was a very low priority to most institutions.

However, in question 16, respondents were asked to indicate the level of emphasis put on the civic engagement aspect of the mission statement. Neither group reached a level of significance, but both groups were above the group mean for all scaled questions. This could indicate that although institutions put importance on including civic engagement in their mission statements, there is not as strong a commitment to actually supporting civic engagement. Likewise, in relation to including civic engagement in an institution’s strategic plan (question 21Q), Group 1 indicated a level of significance ($M = 5.29$). These results combined indicated that Group 1 has a consistent level of commitment to including civic engagement in written documents.

Survey question 19 was a follow up question to the level of funding civic engagement received on each campus. The responses in Table 15 showed that the majority of funding for civic engagement efforts was part of general state allocations for both groups (Group 1 $n= 91$, 54.9%; Group 2 $n= 39$, 69.2%). Results also showed that Group 2 supported civic engagement efforts through community partnerships at a greater frequency (41.0%) than Group 1 (22.0%). The results indicated that both Group 1 and Group 2 had a reasonable amount of funding sources for civic engagement, although Group 1 had a higher level of responses stating they had no specific funding support (35.2%) than Group 2 (20.5%). Additionally, Group 2 indicated a higher level of
dedication to seeking out a variety of funding sources to support their civic engagement efforts.

In order to demonstrate significance between Group 1 and Group 2, an ANOVA (.10 alpha) was conducted on the Likert-scale questions 21A-21H. Results showed a significant difference between Group 1 and Group 2 in how they perceived the presidential leadership on their respective campuses, $F(1, 122) = 3.43, p = .067$; indicating that Group 2 institutions perceived the leadership given by their presidents as stronger than Group 1 institutions.

Research Question 2: To what extent were civic engagement initiatives successful without top level institutional leadership?

The question was answered using the information from survey questions two, 21A, 21B, 21C, 21D, 21E, 21F, 21G, 21H and 21R. Two different Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficients (Pearson’s $r$) were conducted on these questions. Using the same format as in research question one, questions two and 21R were combined to create a single rating score with a range of 11 indicating the level of success for civic engagement initiatives on their campus. Questions 21A – 21H were averaged together to create a mean score for each respondent. Table 20 provides an illustration of the mean and standard deviation for these questions combined, separated by Group.
Table 20.

Combined Indicators of Presidential Leadership (21A-21H)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Campus Compact</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Carnegie Community Engagement</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the limited size of the responses for this question, it was decided to use .5 of the standard deviation of all scaled questions in the survey as the level of significance for mean scores. Responses to questions 21A-21H were divided into two categories based on this calculation; low success scores and high success scores. The dividing mean score for Group 1 respondents was $M = 3.96$ and the diving mean score for Group 2 was $M = 4.46$. Scores lower than these means were put into the low success correlation, while scores that reached this level or higher than these means were included in the high success correlation.

A Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficient (Pearson’s $r$) was conducted between the high success institutions and the level of perceived presidential leadership, to assess the relationship of top level leadership and success of civic engagement initiatives. The assumption was that if institutions had strong leadership in relation to civic engagement, they would be successful in their civic engagement efforts. There proved to be a statistically significant relationship between the two variables, $r = 0.399$, $n = 84$, $p < .10$.

Conversely, another Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficient (Pearson’s $r$) was conducted between the low success institutions and the level of presidential leadership.
leadership to assess the relationship of perceived presidential leadership and success of civic engagement initiatives. The assumption was that if institutions lacked presidential leadership in relation to civic engagement, they would not be successful in their civic engagement efforts. The relationship between these variables approached significance but did not reach an official level of statistical significance, $r = .267, n = 36, p > .10$. The results of the two correlations indicated that although strong presidential leadership had a significant affect on the success of civic engagement, low presidential leadership did not necessarily equal a lack of success.

Research Question 3: To what extent did institutional leadership at any level promote civic engagement on a public university campus?

To answer the research question, survey questions three, four, 21I, 21J, 21K, 21N, and 21O were analyzed for differences between the two groups. Survey questions three and four were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including percentages and frequencies, to draw conclusions regarding factors that contributed to successful civic engagement on university campuses. Responses related to leadership at any level within the institution were specifically examined for this research question.

Survey question three asked respondents to indicate factors they attributed to a lack of success of civic engagement on their respective campuses, with multiple factors being allowed. Both groups indicated the same top three factors as affecting the success of civic engagement; (1) a lack of funding for civic engagement efforts (Group 1 $n=63$, 64.9%; Group 2 $n=22$, 53.7%), (2) civic engagement efforts not included in the tenure and/or promotion process (Group 1 $n=51$, 52.6%; Group 2 $n=22$, 53.7%), and (3) a lack of understanding and support for civic engagement from departments (Group 1 $n=43$, 64.3%; Group 2 $n=22$, 53.7%).
44.3%; Group 2 \(n=21, 51.2\%\)）。Additionally, the factors least attributed for lack of success were the same for both groups; student apathy (Group 1 \(n=16, 16.5\%\); Group 2 \(n=3, 7.3\%\)) and staff apathy (Group 1 \(n=10, 10.3\%\); Group 2 \(n=1, 2.4\%\))。The results indicated that although the frequency and percentage varied between the groups, the fact that they listed the same factors in both the top level of importance and bottom level of importance provided significance to the factors.

Survey question four asked respondents to indicate which single factor they felt had the greatest impact on civic engagement at their respective campuses。The top factors for Group 1 were funding for civic engagement efforts (\(n=18, 18.4\%\)), presidential leadership/support for civic engagement efforts (\(n=18, 18.4\%\)), and support from department chairs/deans for civic engagement efforts (\(n=16, 16.3\%\))。Likewise, the top factors attributed to success of civic engagement for Group 2 were funding for civic engagement efforts (\(n=8, 19.5\%\)), civic engagement efforts included in the tenure and/or promotion process (\(n=8, 19.5\%\)), and support from department chairs/deans for civic engagement efforts (\(n=5, 12.2\%\))。In each group, certain factors did not receive any marks, putting them at the bottom of the list。For Group 1, these were recognition for civic engagement efforts and staff involvement in civic engagement initiatives。For Group 2, these factors were training opportunities on civic engagement, staff involvement in civic engagement initiatives, and student involvement in civic engagement initiatives。The results indicated that funding specifically dedicated to civic engagement was a key factor in success, but they also implied that support from multiple levels of upper-leadership promoted successful civic engagement。
Overall, the two questions implied that although support from presidents, deans, and department chairs was an important factor in the success of civic engagement initiatives, ultimately, funding was the most important. The results also indicated that it was important for institutions to provide adequate recognition for civic engagement efforts. Lastly, there was no support for the idea that staff or student support affects civic engagement success, thereby, indicating that leadership needs to come from administrative levels rather than the students or staff.

An ANOVA was conducted to compare Group 1 and Group 2 on the Likert-type scale questions 21I, 21J, 21K, 21N to draw conclusions about the impact of broad leadership on civic engagement efforts (alpha .10). The results of the analysis did not indicate a significant difference between the two groups, $F(1, 122) = 1.30, p = .256$. The result supported the idea that leadership for civic engagement is stronger from a president than other levels of leadership.

Research Question 4: What types of institutional practices were most effective in developing, supporting, and encouraging civic engagement on a public university campus?

The question was answered using the responses from survey questions three, four, five, six, seven, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21L, 21M, 21P, 21Q, and 22. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data, including percentages, means, frequencies, and standard deviations. The survey asked a variety of questions regarding the most common practices that emerged from the research in an effort to identify which practices and factors were most effective in developing and supporting civic engagement.
As previously discussed, survey questions three and four showed that adequate funding, including civic engagement in the tenure/promotion process, and support from deans and department heads were top factors for developing successful civic engagement. Factors such as staff involvement and student involvement were ranked so low that they appeared to have little perceived influence on the success of civic engagement. Recognition of faculty, staff, or students for their civic engagement efforts and training opportunities were also ranked low by both groups.

The research indicated that integration of civic engagement pedagogies and/or initiatives in the curriculum institution-wide was a positive indicator of successful civic engagement. Therefore, survey question five asked respondents to what extent integration took place on their campuses. The results indicated a greater level of integration on Group 2 \( (n=40, M = 3.66, SD = 1.746) \) campuses than on Group 1 \( (n=93, M = 2.95, SD = 1.582) \) campuses. Comparing these means to the total mean of scaled questions indicated that Group 1 was statistically lower than Group 2, as Group 1 fell more than 1 standard deviation below the scaled questions mean. Question six asked respondents to indicate in which areas on their campuses integration took place. The results showed that in Group 1 and Group 2, the largest percentage of integration took place in specific majors/disciplines (Group 1 \( n=68, 75.6\% \); Group 2 \( n=34, 87.2\% \)) and through Student Affairs programs/events (Group 1 \( n=61, 67.8\% \); Group 2 \( n=31, 79.5\% \)). The results indicated a dedication by academic departments to include civic engagement in majors of study, but a much lower percentage in freshmen-level or core courses (Group 1 \( n=27, 30.0\% \); Group 2 \( n=14, 35.9\% \)). This may also indicate a heavy reliance on student affairs to provide civic engagement for the campus. Question seven asked
respondents to indicate in which forms of civic engagement took place on their campuses. Responses were high in all areas, with community service reported as the top form of civic engagement (Group 1 \(n=92\), 95.8%; Group 2 \(n=40\), 100%). Service-learning was rated second (Group 1 \(n=83\), 86.5%; Group 2 \(n=38\), 95%). The lowest rated form for both groups was problem-based learning (Group 1 \(n=49\), 51%; Group 2 \(n=28\), 70%), although the percentages were still high. The results support the research that civic engagement is varied in how it is conducted on different campuses; however, they also indicated that community service is the most common form of civic engagement facilitated on university campuses. Additionally, the amount of civic engagement in the classroom indicated that there was a focus on teaching students the concepts of engagement.

Faculty involvement emerged in the research as a major factor in the development of civic engagement; therefore, the survey had several questions regarding faculty issues. Question 10 asked respondents to indicate the level of support the upper-administration gave to faculty who were involved in aspects of civic engagement (Group 1 \(n=92\), \(M = 4.95, SD = 1.57\); Group 2 \(n=40\), \(M = 5.43, SD = 1.624\)). Similarly, question 21L asked to what extent faculty who developed service-learning courses received rewards for their efforts (Group 1 \(n=84\), \(M = 3.44, SD = 1.608\); Group 2 \(n=37\), \(M = 4.08, SD = 1.57\)). Finally question 21P asked to what extent faculty were provided with adequate training over civic engagement pedagogies (Group 1 \(n=85\), \(M = 4.09, SD = 1.493\); Group 2 \(n=38\), \(M = 4.68, SD = 1.596\)). The results showed that Group 2 institutions had consistently higher means in relation to faculty support than Group 1 institutions. This implied that Group 2 institutions recognized the importance of supporting and rewarding faculty for
their efforts related to civic engagement, although the mean of the question did not hold significance in relation to the standard deviation of the scaled questions in the survey.

Implied in research question one was that most institutions relied on staff members to facilitate civic engagement, with the majority of those staff being specifically dedicated to civic engagement initiatives. Due to the number of staff members working with civic engagement, the survey included questions relating to staff support. Question 11 asked respondents to indicate the level of support upper-administration gave to staff members involved in civic engagement initiatives (Group 1 \( n=93, M = 4.91, SD = 1.735 \); Group 2 \( n=39, M = 4.85, SD = 1.629 \)). Question 21M asked to what extent staff members who participated in special civic engagement initiatives were rewarded for their efforts (Group 1 \( n=86, M = 3.19, SD = 1.475 \); Group 2 \( n=38, M = 3.39, SD = 1.717 \)). The results indicated a low level of support for staff members involved in civic engagement initiatives. When compared to the support faculty receive, the level of support for staff was generally lower. Additionally, compared to the scaled questions mean, support for staff was statistically lower for Group 2, being more than one standard deviation below the mean. The mean for Group 1 on this question approached a level of low significance, but did not officially reach the level of one standard deviation lower than the mean.

Assessment of civic engagement effort was included as a factor in the Indicators of Civic Engagement by Campus Compact; therefore, the research survey asked two questions related to campus assessment of civic engagement. Question 14 asked respondents to indicate whether or not their institution had a systematic way to assess civic engagement efforts (Group 1 \( n=92, M = 2.28, SD = 3.299 \); Group 2 \( n=39, M = 1.97, SD = 3.191 \)). As mentioned in the discussion under research question one, these results
were at least one standard deviation lower than the scaled questions mean, indicating statistical significance. Question 21 asked if the institution did regular assessments of civic engagement efforts to make improvements (Group 1 $n=85$, $M = 3.62$, $SD = 1.69$; Group 2 $n=38$, $M = 3.61$, $SD = 1.764$). The results of these two questions indicated that assessment of civic engagement is not a high priority for either group.

Survey questions 15, 16, 17, and 20 were all related to the inclusion of civic engagement in the institution’s mission statement and strategic plans. Question 15 asked institutions whether or not their institutional mission statement reflected a focus on civic engagement. The results proved statistically significant for both institutions, being over the standard deviation of the scaled questions mean (Group 1 $n=90$, $M = 5.52$, $SD = 1.582$; Group 2 $n=39$, $M = 5.74$, $SD = 2.721$). Question 16 asked institutions to indicate the level of emphasis the institution put on civic engagement (Group 1 $n=91$, $M = 4.37$, $SD = 2.369$; Group 2 $n=39$, $M = 4.90$, $SD = 2.462$). Question 20 asked respondents to indicate whether or not their institutions included civic engagement in their strategic plan (Group 1 $n=90$, $M = 5.29$, $SD = 3.025$ and Group 2 $n=39$, $M = 5.56$, $SD = 2.864$). The results of the question proved statistically significant for Group 1 and approached significance for Group 2. Overall, the questions indicated that many institutions included civic engagement in their written documents, but as demonstrated through the level of emphasis put toward civic engagement, it could be implied that the inclusion of civic engagement in mission statements and strategic plans is more rhetoric than purposeful action.

Question 17 asked respondents to indicate the manner in which civic engagement was emphasized. The results indicated that the most common form of emphasis was
demonstrated through the campus dedicating an office for civic engagement efforts (Group 1 \(n=66, 72.5\%\) and Group 2 \(n=35, 89.7\%\)). Group 1 reported the following four forms as the most common: (1) an office dedicated to civic engagement (\(n=66, 72.5\%\)), (2) hosting campus-wide programs/events promoting civic engagement (\(n=59, 64.8\%\)), (3) encouragement to develop service-learning courses (\(n=55, 60.4\%\)), and (4) recognition for students involved in civic engagement (\(n=56, 61.5\%\)). Group 2 reported the following four forms as the most common: (1) an office dedicated to civic engagement (\(n=35, 89.7\%\)), (2 & 3 tied) encouragement to develop service-learning course and recognition for students involved in civic engagement (\(n=32, 82.1\%\)), and (4) hosting campus-wide programs/events promoting civic engagement (\(n=29, 74.4\%\)). With both groups reporting the same top four forms, it can be implied that these were consistently frequent between the groups as forms of emphasizing civic engagement.

Interestingly, there were 14 forms for the respondents to choose, and out of these 14 forms, Group 2 had nine that received a frequency over 50%. Group 1 had five that received a frequency score over 50%. This indicated that Group 2 institutions emphasized civic engagement in more ways across campus than Group 1 institutions.

Funding was reported as a primary factor in successful civic engagement, therefore questions 18 and 19 asked respondents to indicate the level of funding they received for civic engagement efforts, and from which sources funding was received. Question 18 indicated that funding was not perceived adequate enough to accomplish goals (Group 1 \(n=91, M = 3.26, SD = 1.78\) and Group 2 \(n=39, M = 3.84, SD = 1.809\)). Question 19 asked respondents to indicate the source of their civic engagement funding, with groups reporting part of state allocations as the primary source of funding (Group 1
Group 2 also reported a large amount of funding for civic engagement from special donations \((n=12, 30.8\%)\) and community partnerships \((n=16, 41\%)\). Overall, Group 2 indicated a wider diversity of funding sources, whereas Group 1 appeared to rely more on one primary funding source. Additionally, Group 1 \((n=32, 35.2\%)\) had a higher percentage of responses indicating no specific funding support than Group 2 \((n=8, 20.5\%)\), implying that institutions within Group 2 dedicated more time to seeking specific funding for civic engagement efforts.

Finally, in question 22 institutions were asked to rank in order of importance which of eight aspects they felt was most important to creating and sustaining successful civic engagement. This question illustrated some significant differences between Group 1 and Group 2. Group 2 overwhelmingly placed the most importance on having an office for civic engagement \((n=38, M = 7.13)\). Group 1 ranked fiscal support/adequate funding as the number one factor for successful civic engagement \((n=79, M = 5.94)\). The highest mean in Group 2 (7.13) was dramatically different than the lowest mean (1.47 for staff recognition and/or rewards). The degree variance between the ranking order for Group 1 was significantly less, with the highest mean being 5.94 and the lowest mean being 2.34. This indicated more consistency among Group 2 institutions in the factors they attribute to successful civic engagement. Table 21 provides a comparative view of each group’s rank order.
Table 21.

Comparing Rank Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Group 1 Rank (Mean)</th>
<th>Group 2 Rank (Mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A civic engagement/community service office</td>
<td>3 (5.65)</td>
<td>1 (7.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty inclusion</td>
<td>4 (5.05)</td>
<td>4 (5.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty recognition and/or rewards</td>
<td>6 (3.91)</td>
<td>5 (4.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal support/adequate funding</td>
<td>1 (5.94)</td>
<td>2 (5.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential leadership/support</td>
<td>2 (5.90)</td>
<td>3 (5.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff recognition and/or rewards</td>
<td>8 (2.34)</td>
<td>8 (1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student inclusion/voice</td>
<td>5 (3.92)</td>
<td>7 (3.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td>7 (3.62)</td>
<td>6 (3.54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the rank order indicated a significant difference in what the groups felt created or sustained successful civic engagement, it is interesting to note that many of the
mean scores for factors were close in score. With the exception of having an office
dedicated to civic engagement, the mean scores implied consistency in the relative level
of importance for each factor.

Chapter Summary

The chapter presented an overview of the study, details of the raw data, and
results of data analysis related to the research questions. The overall results imply that
presidential leadership does have a significant effect on the success level of civic
engagement. However, although presidential leadership appears to have influence, other
levels of leadership did not show any significance. Finally, the last research question
sought to provide statistical evidence of factors with the greatest impact on civic
engagement. The results indicated a number of aspects, but the overwhelming factor in
civic engagement success appeared to be related to institutions having an office dedicated
to civic engagement efforts.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction to the Chapter

Civic engagement, as defined by Ehrlich (2000), is education that teaches students to “make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and motivation to make that difference” (p. vi). This type of education has an extensive history associated with higher education (Benson & Harkavy, 2000; Cohen, 1998; Lucas, 2006; Thelin, 2004). However, although there is theoretical and rhetorical support for civic engagement, many institutions still struggle with implementing effective civic engagement on their campuses. Much of this is due to the vast differences in which civic engagement takes place, thereby contributing to the lack of best practices for institutions to use as guidelines (Checkoway, 2001; Colby et al., 2003; Ehrlich, 2000; Sax, 2004; Swaner, 2007). The aim of the study was to provide an understanding of factors that contribute to successful civic engagement, primarily examining what affect presidential leadership has on that focus. This chapter provided a summary of the study, conclusions derived from the study’s findings, recommendations for practice and further research, and discussion of the study in relation to previous research.

Summary of Study

The research on civic engagement at the college level showed a recurring theme: due to the vast number of variables on each campus, it is not possible to create a scripted plan for successful civic engagement (Colby et al., 2003; Ostrander, 2004; Zlotkowski et al., 2004). Although institutions vary in resources, staffing, faculty involvement,
structure and more, there is one constant with every campus: presidential leadership. Every campus in the United States has a president, therefore, this study sought to examine the influence, or lack thereof, of presidential leadership on civic engagement.

Some of the prominent forces identified as driving civic engagement education were student desire, evidence that civic engagement education enhances student learning, and the pressure for higher education to develop active citizens and provide measureable outcomes (Harward, 2007; Hollister et al., 2008; Galston, 2001; Newman et al., 2004; Savage, 2007).

Although there were a number of driving forces that encourage the development of civic engagement; there were also multitude of challenges. Ward (1996) argued that if universities can receive credit for their rhetoric concerning civic engagement, there is no incentive to put that rhetoric into practice. The involvement of faculty was another significant factor in the development of civic engagement (Caputo, 2005; Hollister et al., 2008; Newman, 1985; Pascarella, 1997).

Much of the current practices related to civic engagement have been focused on community service and service-learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Cohen & Kinsey, 1994; Ehrlich, 1999; Hunter & Brisbin, 2000; Sax, 1997). However, many institutions have started to develop special programs or departments dedicated to civic engagement initiatives to explore other opportunities (Aronson & Webster, 2007; Checkoway, 2007; Hollister et al., 2008). Due to differences, it is difficult to find a single set of prescribed guidelines for developing and maintaining successful civic engagement; however, a variety of strategies and recommendations for developing civic engagement in higher education have been used by institutions. Themes found in the research included
institutional commitment to civic engagement, integration of engagement across the curriculum, variety in the approach to civic engagement, effective leadership, adequate funding, and accountability (Bucher & Patton, 2004; Caputo, 2005; Hollister et al., 2008; Kellogg Commission, 1999; Thornton & Jaeger, 2006; Weinberg, 2005).

The one constant variable on all campuses was an institution’s president; therefore, this factor was examined as the primary focus for the study. According to Nelson (2002) the president sets the institutional tone and mission, and is responsible for seeing that the mission is carried out across campus. Colby et al. (2003) argue that civic engagement education will not be successful on a university campus unless it is supported through both philosophy and resources by the upper levels of administration. Additionally, Ward (1996) found presidential leadership and support to be a recurring theme in the responses to a study to determine effective strategies.

Many universities have chosen to dedicate departmental offices devoted to civic engagement programs, frequently operated by staff members (Colby et al., 2003; Ward, 1996). However, there have been consistent barriers for civic engagement practitioners to engage faculty in civic engagement philosophies and practices (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Ward, 1996.) Additionally, institutions have discovered strong resources off campus through national organizations such as Campus Compact and the American Democracy Project, which provide practical support and encouragement to higher education institutions (Gearan, 2005; Mehaffy, 2005; Ward, 1996).

The study was broken down into four research questions, with the purpose for conducting the study focusing on the effect, or lack thereof, presidential leadership had on the development of civic engagement at public universities. Additionally, the study
sought to identify factors that contributed to successful civic engagement, including different levels of leadership and specific practices. The four research questions were:

1. To what extent did presidential leadership promote civic engagement on a public university campus?

2. To what extent were civic engagement initiatives successful without top level institutional leadership?

3. To what extent did institutional leadership at any level promote civic engagement on a public university campus?

4. What types of institutional support were most effective in developing, supporting, and encouraging civic engagement on a public university campus?

The study used a predefined sample, consisting of four-year, public institutions on the 2010 Campus Compact membership list and the Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement classification list as of 2008. The final number of institutions targeted to receive the survey for each group was: Group 1 (Campus Compact Members) with 282 institutions and Group 2 (Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Classification) with 100 institutions. The differing nature of the institutional selection process for membership and classification provided an opportunity to assess the extent of influence presidential leadership and other types of leadership and practices had on civic engagement at universities. It was assumed that institutions which had been granted the Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement Classification (Group 2) had strong, successful civic engagement efforts on their campuses and could serve as model institutions for developing successful civic engagement.
The comparative study used descriptive statistics, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation (Pearson’s $r$) to assess the influence of presidential leadership on civic engagement on university campuses and to explain which factors could be attributed to successful civic engagement. Electronic surveys were sent to institutions within each of the comparative groups. The survey instrument used in the study was guided by the themes uncovered in the research and compared to the 2008 Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement Reporting Form, the Campus Compact Indicators of Engagement Self-Assessment Guide for Community Colleges, and the 2009 Campus Compact Annual Membership Survey. The survey included questions regarding institutional mission, presidential involvement, fiscal allocation and fundraising, faculty involvement, student involvement, staff involvement, and campus incentives. Out of the 382 institutions chosen to receive the survey, a 155 institutions responded (response rate of 40.6%, $N=155$). However, only 130 institutions completed the survey in its entirety. Out of the 155 participants, 110 ($n=110$, 28.8%) were from Group 1, and 45 ($n=45$, 11.8%) were from Group 2.

Responses were analyzed using a variety of methods, including general descriptive statistics, ANOVAs, and correlations. The findings related to research question one indicated that presidential leadership is statistically important to successful civic engagement. The findings related to research question two, showed a strong correlation between presidential leadership and successful civic engagement efforts. Conversely, results indicated a lack of presidential leadership did not necessarily result in poor civic engagement efforts.

The findings related to research question three indicated that leadership from
other levels within an institution did not have a significant effect on civic engagement efforts, although lack of support from departments and deans was recognized as a problem. The findings from research question four indicated differences in a variety of practices between Group 1 and Group 2, denoting that Group 2 institutions demonstrated more initiative in developing and maintaining successful civic engagement.

Conclusions

1. Presidential leadership is integral to the success of campus-wide civic engagement on a university campus. However, for presidential leadership to be effective, it requires that the president particularly seek and provide funding for civic engagement, recognize the efforts of those on campus participating in civic engagement, and encourage civic engagement in both academic and student affairs. This conclusion is consistent with the research by Colby et al. (2003) which claimed that an institutional mission to civic engagement will not be successful without philosophical and resource support by the administration.

2. Civic engagement can successfully transpire without presidential leadership. Although the study demonstrated a significant correlation between strong presidential leadership and successful civic engagement ($r = .267, n = 36, p > .10$), the reverse concept did not prove significant; lack of presidential leadership did not necessarily equal a lack of successful civic engagement. This finding contradicts Caputo (2005) who stated that institutional leadership was a necessity for civic engagement to be successful.

3. Although there is a large amount of rhetoric supporting civic engagement at higher education institutions, ultimately there is far less actual practice to develop and support civic engagement efforts. According to the findings in the study, civic
engagement was heavily included in campus mission statements and strategic plans, but assessment practices related to civic engagement were extremely limited. Additionally, funding for civic engagement efforts was consistently low, indicating a lack of practical support through resources. This attests the discussion by Ward (1996) who noted two types of reportedly engaged institutions: those that incorporate service as part of the academic experience, and those that merely express it rhetorically.

4. Adequate funding is critical for successful civic engagement efforts, but funding may have to be pulled from a multitude of sources. Funding for civic engagement efforts was consistently reported as one of the top two factors in relation to building adequate and successful civic engagement efforts. Institutions which actively sought out funding from a variety of sources were seemingly better equipped to fund their efforts.

5. Appropriating space and staff for a campus office to develop civic engagement efforts across campus is important to success. The majority of institutions which participated in the study had designated a civic engagement or service-learning position on campus, (Group 1 \(n=63, 59.4\%\) and Group 2 \(n=34, 82.9\%\)). Additionally, institutions in Group 2 overwhelmingly ranked having an office dedicated to civic engagement as the most important factor to success (\(M=7.13\)). This was consistent with Bringle and Hatcher (1996) who believed that a dedicated office was essential to the success of civic engagement across campus.

6. Support and understanding by deans and department chairs is important to successful civic engagement. Both groups ranked support from deans and department chairs as a highly important factor to successful civic engagement. Ehrlich (1999)
commented that academic departments frequently provide rhetorical support for civic engagement efforts in the classroom, but do not support these efforts in practice. According to the findings in the study, having deans and department heads understand and support civic engagement was a significant factor in the overall success of such efforts.

7. Faculty must be recognized for their efforts regarding civic engagement efforts. Specifically, faculty efforts related to civic engagement should be included in the tenure and promotion process. This was a consistent trend in the research, concluding that faculty must be vested in the mission of civic engagement for it to be successful (Aronson & Webster, 2007; Caputo, 2005; Colby et al., 2003; Ostrander, 2004; Ward, 1996).

8. For campus-wide civic engagement to be successful, it must be supported and emphasized in a variety of forms. Institutions that encouraged civic engagement through an array of efforts seem more likely to realize success than those which relied on limited support factors.

9. Staff were regarded as relatively unimportant to the civic engagement mission. Staff involvement and recognition consistently ranked at the bottom in relation to importance. Staff involvement and recognition were addressed in five different questions throughout the survey. In each question, staff recognition or involvement received low or no marks. Although this does not necessarily mean that staff did not contribute to civic engagement success, but it did imply that involvement by staff was of lower concern than almost any other factor. Interestingly, the majority of respondents reported the primary
individual responsible for civic engagement initiatives to be a staff member (Group 1 \( n=106, 59.4\% \) and Group 2 \( n=41, 82.9\% \)).

10. Community service was the most common form of civic engagement on college campuses (Group 1 \( n=96, 95.8\% \) and Group 2 \( n=40, 100\% \)). Service-learning was the second most common form of civic engagement for both groups (Group 1 \( n=96, 86.5\% \) and Group 2 \( n=40, 95\% \)).

Recommendations for Practice

The study sought to examine the extent to which presidential leadership affects civic engagement on university campuses. The findings indicated that strong presidential leadership had a significant effect on successful civic engagement; therefore, if an institution includes civic engagement in its mission statement and desires to build upon that mission, it must be fully supported by the institutional president. Full support includes seeking out and providing funding for civic engagement, supporting and modeling civic engagement, recognizing the efforts of those on campus participating in civic engagement, and encouraging civic engagement in both academic and student affairs. Institutions must move past the rhetoric of merely including civic engagement philosophies in their mission statements, and actively support the efforts. With the relatively frequent turnover of presidents (American Council on Education, 2007), it is important to educate presidents and other upper-level administrators about civic engagement, so as to create a continual chain of experience and knowledge. If a new president does not understand what civic engagement is, he or she will not be able to provide the necessary support to fulfill a civic engagement mission. Additionally,
training other upper-level administrators in the theories, pedagogies and practices of civic engagement will provide a support structure for building campus-wide efforts.

As Ward (1996) discussed, many institutions seemingly provide the appropriate rhetoric regarding civic engagement to gain the approval of the community, accrediting institutions, and governing boards. However, few institutions move past the rhetoric to develop and support active civic engagement. Institutions need to dedicate and seek out adequate resources for civic engagement efforts, offer multiple opportunities for engagement, provide support for campus individuals involved in civic engagement, and assess efforts taking place to determine effectiveness.

Along the same lines, institutions need to designate official offices dedicated to the development and promotion of civic engagement, and allocate adequate staff and resources to facilitate the office’s mission. This not only provides a visible dedication to civic engagement, but it also allows for efforts to be coordinated throughout campus. This may seem like a highly daunting task, but if civic engagement is included in the mission statement of an institution, it warrants the efforts and resources necessary to enable success. Combining current efforts and resources from across campus is a practical means of initially developing a centralized office.

A significant factor in the development of successful civic engagement lies within funding allocations. Institutions must demonstrate dedication to their reported civic engagement mission by providing the necessary funding to accomplish its goals. As demonstrated by the Carnegie Community Engagement institutions, funding does not have to be limited to one singular source. It appeared that institutions with successful civic engagement demonstrated a stronger initiative in securing funding from a variety of
sources. As indicated by the study, funding civic engagement efforts through portions of state or federal allocations is not sufficient to support initiatives. Therefore, institutions must partner with community businesses and organizations, as well as seek out special donations and alumni support.

Support of civic engagement efforts needs to come from all levels of the administration. To help develop support, institutions need to provide adequate training related to civic engagement concepts, pedagogies, and practices. Understanding and support by deans and administrators is more likely to take place if they understand what they are supposed to be supporting. Additionally, it is important to train faculty in civic engagement pedagogies so that they understand how these concepts can benefit their students. Although a large majority of civic engagement activities took place through student affairs programming or other out-of-the-classroom activities, a significant amount was learned through classroom instruction. Therefore, providing support for faculty is a necessity for effective civic engagement.

In addition to providing education and training for faculty, it is crucial to include faculty efforts in the tenure and promotion process. Faculty buy-in and recognition were consistent trends in civic engagement literature and supported by the study. Without faculty support, civic engagement cannot be integrated across a campus. However, for that support to develop, it is imperative to provide some sort of tangible results to those who make the effort to teach civic engagement.

Finally, for an institution to develop campus-wide civic engagement, it must provide a multitude of opportunities and support structures for engagement to take place. In the study, it appeared that Group 2 had more opportunities for involvement and
support for civic engagement than Group 1, indicating a stronger initiative to develop civic engagement. For campus-wide civic engagement to occur, efforts must be integrated into a variety of options, both in academic and student affairs. Limiting opportunities to community service or service-learning is not enough to develop institutional civic engagement.

Recommendations for Future Research

The primary objective of the study was to determine the effect, if any, presidential leadership has on civic engagement efforts on university campuses, and to identify some best practices based on the findings. Since much of the research related to civic engagement is discussion and case study based, this quantitative approach provides a basis for institutions to develop practices for institution-wide civic engagement efforts. Although the study produced some clear findings, it also indicated areas that would benefit from further research.

1. Since the findings indicated that civic engagement efforts could be successful in spite of low presidential leadership, it might be advantageous to further examine institutions that indicated low presidential leadership or involvement. What does civic engagement look like at these institutions? Is civic engagement campus-wide or limited to specific departments?

2. The majority of institutions reported a staff member being in charge of the civic engagement efforts at their institutions, yet, staff recognition and involvement were consistently ranked lowest in importance. There is very little research related to staff involvement in civic engagement, yet most civic engagement efforts on campus appear to be coordinated and promoted by staff members rather than faculty or administration. It
may be beneficial to focus specifically on the extent of impact staff members have on civic engagement and to determine if this group of stakeholders requires the same vested interest that faculty appear to require.

3. The study suggests that having multiple efforts in support and development of civic engagement is the best way to develop campus-wide civic engagement. It was also implied that a campus office is important to coordinate efforts and to promote civic engagement across the campus. It would be helpful to determine the extent to which having an office benefits a campus-wide civic engagement mission.

4. Since it has been determined that presidential leadership is important to the success of civic engagement, it could be useful to examine the motivations that prompt presidents to encourage civic engagement efforts. This could help explain why some institution’s presidents actively support civic engagement in the institutional mission and why some are comfortable with mere rhetoric.

5. The study was narrowed to public, four-year universities, but did not make any limitations as to institutional size. It could be effective to look at these institutions in size groups to examine differences in success given the varied resources at large, medium and small institutions.

6. Some of the questions from the survey had to be discarded due to poor response rates and/or extremely variable responses. These questions asked about the number of hours students, faculty and staff spent participating in civic engagement, and about the number and percentage of service-learning courses on the campus. Many institutions reported that they did not have this information available or it was not currently tracked. Those that did indicate quantifiable responses varied so much that any
statistical study would have been unreliable. It could be very beneficial to look at these areas in farther depth.

Discussion

I became interested in the topic of civic engagement in 2005, after attending an American Democracy Project conference. From that point until now, I have worked at three different institutions, each members of Campus Compact and other support groups for civic engagement. My observations lead me to question how these institutions treated civic engagement. It occurred to me that although individuals on each campus had good intentions to develop civic engagement programs for the students, the impact of these efforts was limited because they were not supported effectively, nor were the efforts campus-wide.

Campus Compact provides a multitude of resources and support for institutions, but ultimately an individual institution must choose to take advantage of those resources. My observations lead me to question how many institutions joined groups such as Campus Compact for the rhetorical benefits, rather than because they wanted to create a lasting campus-wide mission for civic engagement education. By using the Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement classification, the study was able to identify institutions that have moved past the rhetoric to develop civic engagement education which would benefit their campus, students, and community. Using these institutions as the model, provided a comparison group to those institutions that professed a commitment to civic engagement (membership in Campus Compact), but may not reached a level of campus-wide engagement that warrants recognition.
The findings of the study were fairly consistent with the research on civic engagement in higher education, but by running a comparative study, it provides a much needed source of statistical research for the field. It was assumed that presidential leadership would have an effect on the development of successful civic engagement, and this was proven true through this study. Interestingly, while it was demonstrated that there is a strong correlation between good presidential leadership and successful civic engagement efforts, it did not hold true that a lack of presidential leadership equaled a lack of success in civic engagement efforts.

Institutions within Group 2 (Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement classification) indicated higher success levels of civic engagement efforts and stronger presidential leadership support than institutions within Group 1 (Campus Compact members). This supports the implication that although membership in outside organizations that support civic engagement can be helpful, it is frequently used as a form of rhetoric. Institutions wishing to see civic engagement efforts at an institutionalized level must actively support a civic engagement mission.

Another major finding is related to funding issues. While it is not a surprise that funding is important, the study provides empirical evidence supporting the need to fund civic engagement efforts. In the financial climate higher education institutions are currently facing, there is a constant struggle to find adequate funding for educational efforts. The lack of funding is often used as an excuse for the problems associated with civic engagement education. However, Group 2 institutions demonstrated successful civic engagement, even though funding was an issue. These institutions sought funding
from a larger variety of sources than Group 1 institutions, thereby demonstrating a stronger mission to provide for civic engagement efforts on their campuses.

One of the problems of civic engagement identified through the research is the vast assortment of programs and efforts taking place on university campuses. Because there is such variety, it is difficult to prescribe a set of best practices. However, the findings from this study indicate that having a variety of efforts taking place across campus reinforces the civic engagement mission. Institutions in Group 2 had more options for engagement and more support structures than Group 1 institutions, thereby increasing the impact and emphasis of civic engagement across campus. From my personal observations, it is relatively common to have pockets of civic engagement within an institution, but for civic engagement to become a campus-wide mission, it must take place in multiple departments and be coordinated in some manner.

This leads to another major finding from the study; the need for a centralized office for civic engagement efforts. This factor consistently ranked high in level of importance. In my personal observations, each institution I had experience with had strong civic engagement programs taking place on campus. However, due to lack of coordination and resources, most of these programs had little exposure and therefore, many campus stakeholders did not know they existed. Having an office dedicated to the development, implementation, coordination, and assessment of civic engagement efforts provides a better focus for institutional civic engagement.

Chapter Summary

This chapter concludes the study by providing an overview of the study, the 10 conclusions that were reached, recommendations for practice and further research, and a
discussion of the study and implications. The findings of the study support the major
research questions and indicate that presidential leadership is a significant aspect in the
success of civic engagement. All of the factors discussed in this chapter relate back to
presidential leadership, as the president is responsible for setting the institutional mission
and ensuring support of that mission. While funding, recognition, resource allocation,
and program development are each important to the success of a civic engagement
mission, the position of president is the consistent variable across institutions, thereby
giving the position a considerable responsibility to plan, inspire, and motivate the campus
toward institutionalized civic engagement.
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CAMPUS COMPACT’S 13 INDICATORS OF ENGAGEMENT
Appendix A

Campus Compact’s 13 Indicators of Engagement

**Institutional Culture**

*Mission & Purpose (Indicator 1)*

**Definition:**
- The college’s mission explicitly articulates its commitment to the public purposes of higher education and higher education’s civic responsibility to educate for democratic participation.
- This aspect of the mission is openly valued and is explicitly used to promote and to explain the civic activities of the campus.
- The college demonstrates a genuine willingness to review, discuss, and strengthen the civic aspect of its mission.
- All campus constituencies demonstrate their familiarity with and ownership of the college’s mission.

**Best Practices:**
- Include civic/community engagement in the college’s mission statement.
- Write and/or speak publicly about the community role of higher education and of the college itself.
- Create opportunities for faculty and staff to participate in community events.
- Make community partners welcome as part of the campus community; invite them to join advisory boards and other participatory forums.

**Administrative & Academic Leadership (Indicator 2)**

**Definition:**
- The president, the chief academic officer, and the trustees visibly support campus civic engagement, in both their words and their actions.
- The president and the college’s academic leaders have played a visible and committed role in helping the college evolved into a genuinely engaged institution.
- The campus is publicly regarded as an important and reliable partner in local community development efforts.

**Best Practices:**
- Ensure that administrative and academic leaders are directly involved in both internal and external service initiatives.
- Assign responsibility for community relations to a specific staff member with administrative responsibility.
- Create policies and procedures for faculty hiring, retention, and recognition that reward community work.
- Build support for engagement among board members.

**Curriculum & Pedagogy**
Disciplines, Departments, & Interdisciplinary Work (Indicator 3)
(Appendix A continued)

Definition:
- Community-based learning opportunities can be found across the entire curriculum.
- Students have multiple opportunities to do community-based work in their general education and career (vocational, technical, occupational) curricula.
- Formal opportunities exist for capstone experiences focused on community-based problems or issues in most disciplines.
- Academic units rather than individual faculty members have assumed ownership of partnering activities.
- Course-based community initiatives are structured and/or coordinated across disciplines.

Best Practices:
- Enlist department chairs to encourage adoption of engaged practices throughout the department and discipline.
- Work with a community partner to organize projects around a complex community initiative.
- Partner with workforce development and other learning-based programs.
- Create forums for interdisciplinary communication and cooperation.
- Give individual faculty time to devote to service and leeway in developing service-learning initiatives.

Pedagogy & Epistemology (Indicator 4)

Definition:
- Community-based work provides an opportunity for students to generate knowledge, develop critical thinking skills, and grapple with the ambiguity of social problems.
- Community knowledge and community expertise are valued as essential to the education of engaged citizens and are incorporated in various ways throughout the curriculum.
- Experiential learning is valued both by faculty and by administrators as an academically credible method of creating meaning and understanding.
- High-level administrators include service-learning in their strategic plans for enhanced academic learning.
- Students are formally introduced to the concepts and skills necessary for community-based work early on in their academic careers.

Best Practices:
- Integrate service with academics – make it an integral part of course design.
- Ensure that credit is for learning outcomes, not good deeds.
- Define academic outcomes to include all relevant outcomes, including community and workforce development outcomes.
• Give students latitude in choosing projects and project locations.
(Appendix A continued)

• Offer reflection activities to deepen learning.
• Find concrete ways to involve the community in the teaching and learning process.

Faculty Culture
Faculty Development (Indicator 5)
Definition:
• The college regularly provides faculty with in-house opportunities to become familiar with teaching methods and practices related to service-learning.
• Mechanisms have been developed to help faculty mentor and support each other in learning to design and implement service-learning outcomes.
• To enhance their ability to offer quality service-learning courses, faculty have access to curriculum development grants, reduction in teaching loads, and/or travel grants to attend regional and national conferences focused on engaged work.

Best Practices:
• Centralize faculty development resources and build engagement into development efforts.
• Create a culture of service through hiring and buy-in from key academic administrators.
• Provide on-campus training and incentives for participation.
• Actively recruit adjunct faculty to participate in community-related activities.
• Seek external funding to support engagement efforts.
• Document results to justify resources allocation.

Faculty Roles & Rewards (Indicator 6)
Definition:
• The college’s tenure, promotion, and/or retention guidelines reflect a range of scholarly activities such as those proposed by Ernest Boyer (1990).
• Faculty data forms, annual reports, and mandatory evaluations all include sections related to civic engagement, professional service, and/or other forms of academic based public work.
• The college explicitly encourages academic departments to include community-based interests and experience as criteria in their faculty recruiting efforts.

Best Practices:
• Create the expectation that faculty will engage in community-related work.
• Tie career advancement to participation in community activities in a concrete way.

(Appendix A continued)

• Include community work as a component in faculty dossiers and student evaluations.
• Provide informal ways to recognize faculty’s community efforts, such as small grants, awards, and celebrations.

Mechanisms & Resources

Enabling Mechanisms (Indicator 7)

Definition:
• The college maintains a centralized office that is committed to community-based teaching and learning and clearly aligned with academic affairs.
• The college has developed a full range of forms and procedures that allow it to organize and document community-based work.
• Faculty and students are kept well informed of the resources available to support community-based work. These resources are effectively included in all faculty and student orientation programs.
• The college recognizes the unusual demands created by work in the community and attempts to provide flexible scheduling options for faculty and students.
• The college recognizes that course content can be delivered in many ways and allows faculty sufficient freedom to utilize community-based strategies.
• The college recruits and trains student leaders to work with faculty and community partners.

Best Practices:
• Create an office of community-based teaching and learning, or incorporate this function into the work of other offices or centers.
• Set up a website with information directed toward students, faculty, and community partners – including a database with partnership opportunities.
• Use orientations and classroom visits to inform students and faculty of the importance of civic engagement and of specific activities and services.
• Use students as central program resources.
• Provide events and opportunities for engagement, such as employee release time and community fairs.

Internal Resource Allocation (Indicator 8)

Definition:
• Adequate funding is provided to support, enhance, and deepen involvement by faculty, students, and staff in community-based work.
• The college regularly draws upon already existing resources to strengthen engagement activities. Such activities are seen as priorities in the allocation of those resources.

(Appendix A continued)

• The college provides sufficient long-term staffing for all core partnerships and engagement activities. It also provides adequate office space for that staff to do its work.

Best Practices:
• Make engagement a fiscal priority by acknowledging its importance as a teaching tool and including it in the college’s strategic plan.
• Ally with staff development and other existing functions to create efficiencies.
• Create “marketing” materials to publicize the college’s community work.
• Provide sufficient office space for community and service-learning coordination efforts.

Integrated & Complementary Engagement Activities (Indicator 9)
Definition:
• The college effectively coordinates engagement and service-related activities across academic, co-curricular, and non-academic programs.
• The college makes it possible for community partners to understand, access, and easily navigate the full range of its engagement activities.

Best Practices:
• Locate program space centrally to allow maximum collaboration among initiatives.
• Create developmental programs to recruit student leaders.
• Link student affairs, academic affairs, and financial aid through programs that focus on compensated or uncompensated student leadership development.
• Facilitate campus-community communication through publications, information packets, and workshops.

Student Voice (Indicator 10)
Definition:
• Students participate on major institutional committees including those that make personnel decisions.
• The college recognizes student-initiated advocacy campaigns as legitimate forms of democratic practice.

Best Practices:
• Provide opportunities for students to participate as equal members on governance committees and advisory councils.
• Have administrators attend student government meetings to hear and respond to students’ ideas and concerns.
• Encourage formal democratic participation such as meetings with state representatives about issues of importance to students.
• Facilitate direct student activism and engagement in social and political issues.

(Appendix A continued)

**Community-Campus Exchange**

*External Resource Allocation (Indicator 11)*

**Definition:**
• The college helps community partners create a richer learning environment for students working in the community and assists them in accessing human, technical, and intellectual resources on campus.
• The college makes resources available for community-building efforts in local neighborhoods.
• Campus mechanisms have been designed and developed to serve both the campus and the local community.
• The college has intentionally developed purchasing and hiring policies that favor local residents and businesses.

**Best Practices:**
• Involve top administrators on community boards and in community initiatives.
• Encourage faculty to take leadership in the “scholarship of engagement” in their fields.
• Set aside a major portion of work-study funds for community engagement work to build a student “culture of service.”
• Provide community members with access to campus facilities.
• Seek college-community grants and private-sector alliances to enhance economic development.

*Community Voice (Indicator 12)*

**Definition:**
• Community partners are deeply and regularly involved in determining their role in and contribution to community-based learning.
• Community partners play a significant role in helping shape institutional involvement in the community.
• Community partners are well represented on all relevant college-based committees.
• Community partners provide feedback on the development and maintenance of engagement programs and are involved in all relevant strategic planning.
• The college advocates resources to compensate community partners for their participation in service-learning courses.

**Best Practices:**
• Establish communication vehicles such as focus groups, community meetings, newsletters, and reports to the community.
• Give community members a say in setting college priorities.
• Customize college activities – both outreach and academic – to meet local needs.

(Appendix A continued)

Forums for Fostering Public Dialogue (Indicator 13)
Definition:
• The college plays a visible and effective role in facilitating dialogue around important public issues.
• The college helps to bring together stakeholders from all sectors of the community.

Best Practices:
• Convene campus and community members to discuss local and national issues of mutual relevance.
• Provide training for students and faculty in moderating public dialogue.
• Coordinate the work of external affairs, student affairs, and other offices to create broad initiatives that involve multiple constituencies.
• Involve legislators and other public officials in dialogues to give community members a channel to government decision-makers.

APPENDIX B

COMPREHENSIVE ACTION PLAN FOR SERVICE-LEARNING (CAPSL) MODEL
Appendix B

Comprehensive Action Plan for Service-Learning (CAPSL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototype</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To be completed by each stakeholder group with their plan for each category.
APPENDIX C

ENGAGEMENT LADDER MODEL AT PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Appendix C

Penn State’s Engagement Ladder Model

STEPS

Step 1: Strategic Vision
- Integration of teaching, research, and outreach to inform each other and maximize the use of scarce University resources
- Develop a scholarship of relevance
- Bridge gaps between research, practices, and policies

Step 2: Organize for Engagement
- Increase physical presence of the University in communities
- Create reciprocal connectivity to communities
- Establish institutes, consortia, and relevant centers
- Reward inter-disciplinary activity with communities
- Share credit on extramural funding

Step 3: Faculty Buy-In
- Develop institutes and consortia centers
- Development of Public Scholars Associates
- Encouragement for community based learning and teaching (service-learning)

Step 4: Student Empowerment
- Provide outlets for engagement
- Student activists for socially relevant education
- Students sought tangible responses from the University

Step 5: Community partnering
- Flexibly adopting appropriate/needed role with community
- Capitalizing on pre-existing community relationships of Penn State Outreach
- Collaborative relationship between faculty and Outreach

*These steps follow the events that took place at Penn State from 1999 to 2007.*
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Seven-Part Test of Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Questions for Internal Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>Are we listening to the communities, regions, and states we serve?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for partners</td>
<td>Does the institution genuinely respect the skills and capacities of our partners in collaborative projects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic neutrality</td>
<td>Does university outreach maintain the university in the role of neutral facilitator and source of information when public policy issues, particularly contentious ones, are at stake?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Do we properly publicize our activities and resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have we made a concentrated effort to increase community awareness of the resources and programs available from us that might be useful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can we honestly say that our expertise is equally accessible to all the constituencies of concern our states and communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>What kinds of incentives are useful in encouraging faculty and student commitment to engagement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will respected faculty and student leaders not only participate but also serve as advocates for the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Are academic units dealing with each other productively?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Appendix D continued)

Do the communications and government relations offices understand the engagement agenda?

Do faculty, staff, and students need help in developing the skills of translating expert knowledge into something the public can appreciate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource partnerships</th>
<th>Are resources committed to the task sufficient?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where will funds be found?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The President’s Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education

As presidents of colleges and universities, both private and public, large and small, two-year and four-year, we challenge higher education to re-examine its public purposes and its commitments to the democratic ideal. We also challenge higher education to become engaged, through actions and teaching, with its communities. We have a fundamental task to renew our role as agents of our democracy. This task is both urgent and long-term. There is growing evidence of disengagement of many Americans from the communal life of our society in general, and from the responsibilities of democracy in particular. We share a special concern about the disengagement of college students from democratic participation. A chorus of studies reveals that students are not connected to the larger purposes and aspirations of the American democracy. Voter turnout is low. Feelings that political participation will not make any difference are high. Added to this, there is a profound sense of cynicism and lack of trust in the political process.

We are encouraged that more and more students are volunteering and participating in public and community service, and we have all encouraged them to do so through curricular and co-curricular activity. However, this service is not leading students to embrace the duties of active citizenship and civic participation. We do not blame these college students for their attitudes toward the democracy; rather, we take responsibility for helping them realize the values and skills of our democratic society and their need to claim ownership of it.

This country cannot afford to educate a generation that acquires knowledge without ever understanding how that knowledge can benefit society or how to influence democratic decision making. We must teach the skills and values of democracy, creating innumerable opportunities for our students to practice and reap the results of the real, hard work of citizenship.

Colleges and universities have long embraced a mission to educate students for citizenship. But now, with over two-thirds of recent high school graduates and ever-larger numbers of adults enrolling in post-secondary studies, higher education has an unprecedented opportunity to influence the democratic knowledge, dispositions, and habits of the heart that graduates carry with them into the public square.

Higher education is uniquely positioned to help Americans understand the histories and contours of our present challenges as a diverse democracy. It is also uniquely positioned to help both students and our communities to explore new ways of fulfilling the promise of justice and dignity for all, both in our own democracy and as part of the global community. We know that pluralism is a source of strength and vitality that will enrich our students’ education and help them learn both to respect difference and to work together for the common good.
We live in a time when every sector — corporate, government, and nonprofit — is being mobilized to address community needs and reinvigorate our democracy... We cannot be complacent in the face of a country where one out of five children sleeps in poverty and one in six central cities has an unemployment rate 50 percent or more above the national average, even as our economy shows unprecedented strength. Higher education — its leaders, students, faculty, staff, trustees, and alumni — remains a key institutional force in our culture that can respond, and can do so without a political agenda and with the intellectual and professional capacities today’s challenges so desperately demand. Thus, for society’s benefit and for the academy’s, we need to do more. Only by demonstrating the democratic principles we espouse can higher education effectively educate our students to be good citizens.

How can we realize this vision of institutional public engagement? It will, of course, take as many forms as there are types of colleges and universities. And it will require our hard work, as a whole and within each of our institutions. We will know we are successful by the robust debate on our campuses, and by the civic behaviors of our students. We will know it by the civic engagement of our faculty. We will know it when our community partnerships improve the quality of community life and the quality of the education we provide.

To achieve these goals, our presidential leadership is essential but, by itself, it is not enough. Faculty, staff, trustees, and students must help craft and act upon our civic missions and responsibilities. We must seek reciprocal partnerships with community leaders, such as those responsible for elementary and secondary education. To achieve our goals we must define them in ways that inspire our institutional missions and help measure our success. We have suggested a Campus Assessment of Civic Responsibility that will help in this task.

We ask other college presidents to join us in seeking recognition of civic responsibility in accreditation procedures, Carnegie classifications, and national rankings and to work with governors, state legislators, and state higher education offices on state expectations for civic engagement in public systems.

We believe that the challenge of the next millennium is the renewal of our own democratic life and reassertion of social stewardship. In celebrating the birth of our democracy, we can think of no nobler task than committing ourselves to helping catalyze and lead a national movement to reinvigorate the public purposes and civic mission of higher education. We believe that now and through the next century, our institutions must be vital agents and architects of a flourishing democracy.

We urge all of higher education to join us.
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Membership Requirements

1. A letter from the president explaining why you are seeking membership in Campus Compact.

2. A completed Membership Information form (enclosed). This form lists eight key contact people from your college or university. These individuals will receive information, publications, and mailings directly from us. Some member campuses may not be able to provide all of these contacts, so please note that they are listed in priority order.

3. Payment of the membership fee (see fee schedule below). Checks should be made payable to Campus Compact and mailed to:

   Campus Compact
   45 Temple Place
   Boston, MA 02111

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of full-time undergraduate equivalent (FTE)</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 3,000</td>
<td>$387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,001 to 7,000</td>
<td>$972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,001 to 13,000</td>
<td>$1,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,001 to 20,000</td>
<td>$2,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 to 30,000</td>
<td>$2,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 to 40,000</td>
<td>$3,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001 +</td>
<td>$4,764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: If your president joins after January 1 (mid-year), only half of the annual fee is required for new membership.

Thank you for your interest in Campus Compact!
APPENDIX G

CARNEGIE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CLASSIFICATION CATEGORY DESCRIPTIONS
Appendix G

Carnegie Community Engagement Classification Category Descriptions

In 2006 and 2008, the classification included three categories:

**Curricular Engagement** includes institutions where teaching, learning and scholarship engage faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration. Their interactions address community-identified needs, deepen students’ civic and academic learning, enhance community well-being, and enrich the scholarship of the institution.

**Outreach & Partnerships** includes institutions that provided compelling evidence of one or both of two approaches to community engagement. Outreach focuses on the application and provision of institutional resources for community use with benefits to both campus and community. Partnerships focus on collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, information, and resources (research, capacity building, economic development, etc.).

**Curricular Engagement and Outreach & Partnerships** includes institutions with substantial commitments in both areas described above.

*For the 2010 classification, the combined category will no longer be used. Institutions will apply for classification through either Curricular Engagement or Outreach and Partnerships.*
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Carnegie Foundation Elective Classification: Community Engagement – 2008 Documentation

*For the sake of space, the cover letter and introduction of this document were removed.

II. FOUNDATIONAL INDICATORS
A. Institutional Identity and Culture
Required Documentation (complete all 5 of the following)

1. Does the institution indicate that community engagement is a priority in its mission statement (or vision)?
   ____ Yes _____ No __________ Quote the mission (vision)

2. Does the institution formally recognize community engagement through campus-wide awards and celebrations?
   ____ Yes _____ No __________ Describe with examples

3. a. Does the institution have mechanisms for systematic assessment of community perceptions of the institution’s engagement with community?
       ____ Yes _____ No __________ Describe the mechanisms

        b. Does the institution aggregate and use the assessment data?
           ____ Yes _____ No __________ Describe how the data is used

4. Is community engagement emphasized in the marketing materials (website, brochures, etc.) of the institution?
   ____ Yes _____ No __________ Describe the materials

5. Does the executive leadership of the institution (President, Provost, Chancellor, Trustees, etc.) explicitly promote community engagement as a priority?
   ____ Yes _____ No __________ Describe examples such as annual address, published editorial, campus publications, etc.

B. Institutional Commitment
Required Documentation (complete all 6 of the following)

1. Does the institution have a campus-wide coordinating infrastructure (center, office, etc.) to support and advance community engagement?
   ____ Yes _____ No __________ Describe with purposes, staffing

2. a. Are there internal budgetary allocations dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with community?
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_____ Yes  _____ No  __________ Describe source, whether it is permanent, and how it is used, etc.

b. Is there fundraising directed to community engagement?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  __________ Describe fundraising activities

3. a. Does the institution maintain systematic campus-wide tracking or documentation mechanisms to record and/or track engagement in community?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  __________ Describe

   b. If yes, does the institution use the data from those mechanisms?
      _____ Yes  _____ No  __________ Describe

   c. Are there systematic campus-wide assessment mechanisms to measure the impact of institutional engagement?
      _____ Yes  _____ No

   d. If yes, indicate the focus of those mechanisms
      _____ Impact on students  __________ Describe one key finding
      _____ Impact on faculty  __________ Describe one key finding
      _____ Impact on community  __________ Describe one key finding
      _____ Impact on institution  __________ Describe one key finding

   e. Does the institution use the data from the assessment mechanisms?
      _____ Yes  _____ No  __________ Describe

4. Is community engagement defined and planned for in the strategic plans of the institution?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  __________ Describe and quote

5. Does the institution provide professional development support for faculty and/or staff who engage with community?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  __________ Describe

6. Does community have a “voice” or role in institutional or departmental planning for community engagement?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  __________ Describe

Supplemental Documentation (complete all of the following)

1. Does the institution have search/recruitment policies that encourage the hiring of faculty with expertise in and commitment to community engagement?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  __________ Describe
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2.  a.  Do the institutional policies for promotion and tenure reward the scholarship of community engagement?
   _____ Yes _____ No __________ Describe

   b.  If yes, how does the institution classify community engaged scholarship? (Service, Scholarship of Application, other)
   __________ Explain

   b (cont’d).  If no, is there work in progress to revise promotion and tenure guidelines to reward the scholarship of community engagement?
   _____ Yes _____ No __________ Describe

3.  Do students have a leadership role in community engagement?  What kind of decisions do they influence (planning, implementation, assessment, or other)?
   _____ Yes _____ No __________ Examples

4.  Is community engagement noted on student transcripts?
   _____ Yes _____ No __________ Describe

5.  Is there a faculty governance committee with responsibilities for community engagement?
   _____ Yes _____ No __________ Describe

III. CATEGORIES OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

A. Curricular Engagement
Curricular Engagement describes the teaching, learning and scholarship that engages faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration. Their interactions address community identified needs, deepen students’ civic and academic learning, enhance community well-being, and enrich the scholarship of the institution.

NOTE: The terms community-based learning, academic service learning, and other expressions are often used to denote service learning courses.

1.  a.  Does the institution have a definition and a process for identifying service learning courses?
   _____ Yes _____ No __________ Describe requirements

   b.  How many formal for-credit service learning courses were offered in the most recent academic year?  What percentage of total courses?

   c.  How many departments are represented by those courses?  What percentage of total departments?
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d. How many faculty taught service learning courses in the most recent academic year? What percentage of faculty?

e. How many students participated in service learning courses in the most recent academic year? What percentage of students?

2. a. Are there institutional (campus-wide) learning outcomes for students’ curricular engagement?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  __________ Provide specific learning outcome examples

   b. Are there departmental or disciplinary learning outcomes for students’ curricular engagement?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  __________ Provide specific learning outcome examples

   c. Are those outcomes systematically assessed?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  __________ Describe

3. a. Is community engagement integrated into the following curricular activities?
   _____ Student Research
   _____ Student Leadership
   _____ Internships/Co-ops
   _____ Study Abroad
   __________ Describe with examples

   b. Has community engagement been integrated with curriculum on an institution-wide level?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  __________ Describe with examples
   If yes, indicate where the integration exists.
   _____ Core Courses  _____ Graduate Studies
   _____ First Year Sequence  _____ Capstone (Senior level project)
   _____ In the Majors  _____ General Education

4. Are there examples of faculty scholarship associated with their curricular engagement achievements (action research studies, conference presentations, pedagogy workshops, publications, etc.)?
   _____ Yes  _____ No  __________ Provide a minimum of five examples from different disciplines

B. Outreach and Partnerships
Outreach and Partnerships describe two different but related approaches to community engagement. The first focuses on the application and provision of institutional resources for community use with benefits to both campus and community. The latter focuses on collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually
beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, information, and resources (research, capacity building, economic development, etc.

1. Indicate which outreach programs are developed for community:
   _____ learning centers   _____ tutoring
   _____ extension programs   _____ non-credit courses
   _____ evaluation support   _____ training programs
   _____ professional development centers   _____ other (specify)
   __________ Describe with examples

2. Which institutional resources are provided as outreach to the community?
   _____ co-curricular student service   _____ work/study student placement
   _____ cultural offerings   _____ athletic offerings
   _____ library services   _____ technology
   _____ faculty consultation
   __________ Describe with examples

3. Using the following grid, describe representative partnerships (both institutional and departmental) that were in place during the most recent academic year. (maximum 15 partnerships)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Name</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. a. Does the institution or do the departments work to promote the mutuality and reciprocity of the partnerships?
   _____ Yes   _____ No   __________ Describe the strategies

   b. Are there mechanisms to systematically provide feedback and assessment to community partners?
   _____ Yes   _____ No   __________ Describe the mechanisms
5. Are there examples of faculty scholarship associated with their outreach and partnerships activities (technical reports, curriculum, research reports, policy reports, publications, etc.)?  
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_____ Yes _____ No __________ Provide a minimum of five examples from varied disciplines

IV. WRAP-UP

1. (Optional) Use this space to elaborate on any short-answer item(s) where you need more space. Please specify the corresponding section and item number(s).

2. (Optional) Is there any information that was not requested that you consider significant evidence of your institution’s community engagement? If so, please provide the information in this space.

3. (Optional) Please provide any suggestions or comments you may have on the documentation process and online data collection.

4. May we use the information you have provided for research purposes beyond the determination of classification (for example, conference papers, journal articles, and research reports), with the understanding that your institution’s identity will not be disclosed without permission? (Your answer will have no bearing on the classification decision.)

_____ Yes _____ No

*This documentation was designed as a facsimile and was actually administered through a web-based data collection in 2008.*
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Notification Letter for Survey

Dear Civic Engagement Initiatives Coordinator/Director,

I am a doctoral student in the Higher Education Leadership program at the University of Arkansas and I am currently in the process of completing my doctoral dissertation. The research focus for my dissertation is specifically interested in the effects of presidential leadership on civic engagement at public, 4-year or higher universities.

Your institution was selected based on membership with Campus Compact and/or your institution’s classification as a Community Engagement institution under the Carnegie Foundation’s classification system. Your institution will not be identified in any of the survey results.

Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary, and you can retain the right to withdraw from the process at any time. Within the next week, the survey will be sent out to you using the online survey system, SurveyMonkey. It will take between 15-20 minutes to complete the survey.

Please direct any questions or concerns to me through email at (personal email) or by phone at (personal phone). You may also contact my dissertation chair, Dr. Michael Miller at mtmille@uark.edu or by phone at 479-575-3582. Thank you, in advance, for your participation in this study.

Sincerely,

Prairie L. Burgess
Doctoral Candidate
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List of Institutions (Group 1 and Group 2)

Group 1 Institutions (listed by state), 110 participated (89 complete)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arkansas</th>
<th>Eastern Illinois University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas at Little Rock</td>
<td>Northeastern Illinois University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Western Illinois University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Channel Islands</td>
<td>Indiana University, Bloomington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Northridge</td>
<td>Indiana University East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>Indiana University South Bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, San Francisco</td>
<td>Indiana University – Purdue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams State</td>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lewis College</td>
<td>Southeastern Louisiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan State College of Denver</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Fitchburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Connecticut State University</td>
<td>Framingham State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Connecticut State University</td>
<td>Salem State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Coppin State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
<td>University of Maryland, Baltimore County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>University of Maryland, College Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td>University of West Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of West Florida</td>
<td>Columbus State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Kennesaw State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Hawaii University at Manoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>Ferris State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Grand Valley State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis – Clark State College</td>
<td>Oakland University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>University of Michigan – Dearborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Rochester</td>
<td>St. Cloud State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Missouri**
Lincoln University
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Missouri State University,
Springfield
University of Central Missouri
University of Missouri, St. Louis

**Mississippi**
Jackson State University
University of Southern Mississippi

**Montana**
Montana State University - Northern
Montana Tech of the University of
Montana

**North Carolina**
Fayetteville State University
North Carolina A&T State
  University

**North Dakota**
Minot State University

**New Hampshire**
Plymouth State College

**New Mexico**
University of New Mexico

**New York**
Alfred State College
Binghamton University (SUNY)
Buffalo State College
City College of New York
Farmingdale State College (SUNY)
Lehman College
SUNY College of Ag & Tech at
  Cobleskill
SUNY College of Tech at Delhi
SUNY at Fredonia
SUNY at Oswego

**Ohio**
Cleveland State University

**Oklahoma**
Cameron University
Oklahoma Panhandle State
  University
Southeastern Oklahoma State
  University
University of Central Oklahoma

**Oregon**
Southern Oregon University

**Pennsylvania**
Shippenburg University of
  Pennsylvania
Temple University
University of Pittsburg at Johnstown

**Rhode Island**
University of Rhode Island

**Tennessee**
Austin Peay State University
Tennessee Tech University
University of Tennessee at Martin
University of Tennessee at Knoxville

**Texas**
Sam Houston State University
University of Texas at Austin
University of Texas at San Antonio
University of Texas at Arlington
West Texas A&M University

**Utah**
University of Utah
Utah State University

**Virginia**
University of Virginia

**Washington**
Eastern Washington University
University of Washington – Bothell
University of Washington – Tacoma

**Wisconsin**
University of Wisconsin – Eau
  Claire
University of Wisconsin – Oshkosh
University of Wisconsin – River
  Falls
University of Wisconsin – Superior

**West Virginia**
Concord University
Fairmont State University
Marshall University
Shepherd University
West Virginia School of Osteopathic
  Medicine
Wyoming
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University of Wyoming

Group Two Institutions (listed by state), 45 participated (41 complete)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alaska</strong></td>
<td>University of Alaska, Anchorage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California</strong></td>
<td>California State University – Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California State University – San Bernardino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California State University – Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of California – Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colorado</strong></td>
<td>Colorado State University - Pueblo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Florida</strong></td>
<td>Florida Gulf Cost University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iowa</strong></td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Northern Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idaho</strong></td>
<td>Boise State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illinois</strong></td>
<td>Northern Illinois University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana University – Purdue University, Indianapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Southern Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kentucky</strong></td>
<td>Morehead State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Kentucky University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Massachusetts</strong></td>
<td>Massachusetts College of Art and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Massachusetts, Amherst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Massachusetts, Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maryland</strong></td>
<td>Towson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michigan</strong></td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minnesota</strong></td>
<td>Metropolitan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Minnesota, Twin Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Carolina</strong></td>
<td>University of North Carolina at Pembroke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Dakota</strong></td>
<td>University of North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nebraska</strong></td>
<td>University of Nebraska at Omaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Hampshire</strong></td>
<td>Keene State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York</strong></td>
<td>SUNY College at Cortland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohio</strong></td>
<td>Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio State University, Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oklahoma</strong></td>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon</strong></td>
<td>Portland State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pennsylvania</strong></td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Carolina</strong></td>
<td>Clemson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texas</strong></td>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Houston, Clear Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia</strong></td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vermont</strong></td>
<td>University of Vermont &amp; State Agricultural College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wisconsin</strong></td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Parkside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Survey Instrument

Presidential Leadership on Civic Engagement Survey

Introduction to Survey Instrument
This survey was designed to assess the impact of presidential leadership on civic engagement at public, 4-year or higher institutions in the United States. Please respond to the following questions based on your perceptions and understanding of what takes place on your campus. The information gathered from this will be used to draw inferences for a doctoral dissertation. Only group data will be reported in the dissertation; individual institutions will not be identified.

The survey should take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. You are encouraged to review the survey before filling it out to determine if you need to gather any information before completing it online. Please respond using information from the 2008-2009 academic year.

There are 39 questions in this survey. The first 20 questions are multiple choice questions. Questions 21-38 are on a Likert-scale. The final question asks you to rank items.

If you have questions or concerns regarding the study, please contact Prairie Burgess (personal email) or Dr. Michael Miller (mtmille@uark.edu).

Section 1 – Institutional Information
1. Who is the person primarily responsible for civic engagement initiatives on your campus (for example, who would fill out the Campus Compact Annual Membership Survey)? Choose the title that fits closest with the position on your campus.
   □ President/Chancellor
   □ Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs
   □ Vice President of Student Affairs
   □ Director/Coordinator of Civic Engagement Office
   □ Director/Coordinator of Student Activities
   □ Director/Coordinator of Service-Learning
   □ A Faculty Member (which discipline?): _______________
   □ Other: ________________________________

Section 2 - Civic Engagement
2. How would you rate civic engagement at your university relative your university’s peer institutions?
   □ Highly successful
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3. Which of the following would you attribute to the lack of success of civic engagement on your campus? Check all that apply.
- Lack of funding for civic engagement efforts
- Lack of presidential leadership/support for civic engagement
- Lack of programs and initiatives focused on civic engagement
- Lack of organization for civic engagement efforts
- Lack of recognition for civic engagement efforts (faculty, staff, and student)
- Lack of understanding of civic engagement
- Lack of training on civic engagement
- Faculty apathy toward civic engagement
- Staff apathy toward civic engagement
- Student apathy toward civic engagement
- Lack of understanding and support for civic engagement from departments
- Other (please specify): _______________________________________________

4. Which of the following attributes would you think might have the greatest positive impact on civic engagement on your campus?
- Funding for civic engagement efforts
- Presidential leadership/support for civic engagement efforts
- Specific programs and initiatives focused on civic engagement
- Good organization for civic engagement efforts
- Recognition for civic engagement efforts (faculty, staff, and student)
- Training opportunities on civic engagement
- Good understanding of civic engagement
- Faculty involvement in civic engagement initiatives
- Staff involvement in civic engagement initiatives
- Student involvement in civic engagement initiatives
- Support from department chairs/deans for civic engagement efforts
- Other (please specify): _______________________________________________

5. To what extent have civic engagement pedagogies and/or initiatives been integrated with curriculum at an institutional-wide level?
- Heavily Integrated
- Moderately Integrated
- Partially Integrated
- Not Integrated

6. In what areas has integration taken place? Check all that apply.
Freshman Year Experience programs/courses
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- Core curriculum courses
- Graduate study programs/courses
- In specific Majors/Disciplines
- Student Affairs programs/events

7. What forms of civic engagement take place at your campus (by faculty, staff, and/or students)? Check all that apply.
   - Community service
   - On-campus service
   - Collaborative learning in the classroom
   - Problem-based learning in the classroom
   - Service-learning
   - Student leadership development
   - Other (please specify): ________________________________________________

8. How many hours were students involved in community service, service-learning, or other types of civic engagement this past year? (Estimate hours).

   ______

  ☐ Unknown/Not Tracked

9. How many hours were faculty and staff involved in community service, service-learning, or other types of civic engagement this past year? (Estimate hours for each group).

   ______ Faculty
   ______ Staff
   ______ Unknown/Not Tracked

10. How much support does the upper-administration (president and vice presidents) give faculty for involvement in community service, service-learning, and other types of civic engagement?
    - Extremely supportive
    - Somewhat supportive
    - Neither supportive or non-supportive
    - Not very supportive
    - Not supportive at all

11. How much support does the upper-administration (president and vice presidents) give staff for involvement in community service, service-learning, and other types of civic engagement?
    - Extremely supportive
    - Somewhat supportive
    - Neither supportive or non-supportive
    - Not very supportive
☐ Not supportive at all
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12. How many service-learning courses (courses offering service-learning as a part of the course, or as the whole course) were offered at your institution this past year?

☐ Unknown/Not Tracked

13. What percentage of the total course offerings were the service-learning courses?

☐ Unknown/Not Tracked

14. Is there an organized, systematic way to assess civic engagement on your campus?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

Section 3 - Institutional Support

15. Does your institution’s mission statement reflect a focus on civic engagement?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No
   (If the answer is no, skip to question 17).

16. If yes to #15, how much emphasis is put on that focus?
   ☐ Heavily emphasized
   ☐ Moderately emphasized
   ☐ Neither emphasized or not emphasized
   ☐ Not emphasized much
   ☐ Relatively ignored

17. In what ways is civic engagement emphasized on your campus?
   ☐ Campus has an office devoted to community service, service-learning, and/or civic engagement
   ☐ Community service, service-learning, and/or civic engagement is required for graduation
   ☐ Encouragement to develop service-learning courses
   ☐ Funding allocated for civic engagement initiatives
   ☐ Funding allocated for travel to civic engagement conferences/workshops for faculty, staff, and/or students
   ☐ Hosts special campus-wide programs/events promoting civic engagement
   ☐ Offers courses on volunteerism, activism, and/or advocacy
   ☐ Provides funding (grants) to students for service-related initiatives
   ☐ Provides room on transcripts for service records
   ☐ Provides training for faculty on civic engagement pedagogies
   ☐ Recognition for faculty involved in civic engagement
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☐ Recognition for staff involved in civic engagement
☐ Recognition for students involved in civic engagement
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☐ Requires service-learning as part of degree plans (one or more majors)

18. Is the funding for civic engagement initiatives (community service programs, service-learning courses, civic engagement offices, etc.) adequate to accomplish goals?
☐ Very adequate
☐ Moderately adequate
☐ Neither adequate or inadequate
☐ Barely adequate
☐ Not adequate at all
☐ No specific funding allocated

19. What sources of funding support the civic engagement initiatives on your campus? Check all that apply.
☐ Part of state allocations
☐ Part of federal allocation
☐ Special donations
☐ Alumni giving
☐ Community partnerships

20. Does your institution have a strategic plan that includes civic engagement?
☐ Yes
☐ No

Section 4 - Scaled Questions:
For the following questions, answer using a Likert-scale of 1-7.
1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=somewhat disagree 4=neutral opinion
5=somewhat agree 6=agree 7=strongly agree

21a. The president seeks out funding to support civic engagement on our campus.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21b. The president supports the civic engagement agenda in the institution’s mission statement both verbally and practically. (If your institution does not include civic engagement in its mission statement, please mark N/A).
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 N/A

21c. The president models civic engagement through participation in community and civic groups.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21d. The president promotes recognition of faculty and staff who engage in civic engagement, community service, and/or service-learning.
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21e. The president seeks to provide adequate funding for civic engagement.

21f. The president believes in the concept of civic engagement and makes that evident through personal actions.

21g. The president encourages development of civic engagement initiatives in academic programs.

21h. The president encourages development of civic engagement initiatives in student affairs programming.

21i. The vice presidents and deans believe in the concept of civic engagement and makes that evident through personal actions.

21j. The vice presidents and deans support development of civic engagement initiatives in academic programs.

21k. The vice presidents and deans support development of civic engagement initiatives in student affairs programming.

21l. Faculty members who develop service-learning courses are rewarded for their efforts (financially, through tenure, special recognition, etc.).

21m. Staff members who participate in special civic engagement initiatives are rewarded for their efforts (financially, special recognition, time off with pay, etc.).

21n. The different divisions on our campus (academic teaching, academic research, and student affairs) work effectively together to promote civic engagement.
21o. The faculty members on campus believe in the concept of civic engagement and are supporters and/or advocates for civic engagement education.  

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
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21p. Faculty members are provided with adequate training over civic engagement pedagogies (understand the pedagogies and how to implement them in courses).  

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

21q. My institution does regular, organized assessments of civic engagement efforts and uses the information to make improvements.  

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

21r. Compared to peer institutions, my institution’s civic engagement efforts are highly successful.  

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

22. For the following question, rank each one based on your perception of what is most important to creating or sustaining successful civic engagement on your campus. There are 8 items on the list. Rate the item you feel MOST important as #8 and progress downward to least important as #1.

- A civic engagement/community service office
- Faculty inclusion
- Faculty recognition and/or rewards
- Fiscal support/adequate funding
- Presidential leadership/support
- Staff recognition and/or rewards
- Student inclusion/voice
- Training and development
APPENDIX L

CAMPUS COMPACT ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP SURVEY FOR 2009
Appendix L
Campus Compact Annual Membership Survey for 2009

Campus Compact 2009 Annual Membership Survey

Welcome and Respondent Information
Welcome! This survey seeks to capture data for the 2008-2009 academic year. Only one survey should be completed for each Campus Compact member higher education institute. The last day to submit information on behalf of your institution is Friday, December 4, 2009.

We are relying on your feedback to calculate student and faculty involvement in community service, service-learning, and civic engagement activities; to understand institutional support/culture, community-campus partnerships, and assessment; and to gauge satisfaction with Campus Compact programs and services.

This survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete if you have prepared in advance to answer the questions. We encourage you to view and/or print a blank copy of the entire survey before starting it online. To do so, return to the Campus Compact website to download the PDF version. Please note: you must submit your survey responses online.

Your responses will be saved on each page of the survey as you advance to the next. If you have enabled cookies on your computer, you may return to the survey web link at any time to change/add responses before submitting your completed survey. (To learn more about enabling cookies on your computer, visit http://www.surveymonkey.com/helpcenter/Answer.aspx?HelpID=141&q=cookies.) Once you select the submit button on the last page of the survey, you will not be able to edit or return. Please make sure that you have completed all survey questions with the best available data before selecting the submit button.

If you have any questions about the survey, please contact Kristen Farrell at kfarrell@compact.org.

*1. Please provide your most current contact information. Use full names; do not abbreviate. Campus Compact will not share your contact information with any third parties.
Name ____________________________________________________
Title ____________________________________________________
Institution ____________________________________________________
Street Address ____________________________________________________
City ____________________________________________________
State ____________________________________________________
Zip Code ____________________________________________________
Email Address ____________________________________________________

Institutional Information
1. Which best characterizes your college or university?
   _____ Public two-year
   _____ Private two-year
   _____ Public four-year
   _____ Private four-year
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2. What other characteristics apply to your college or university? (Check all that apply.)

- Business
- Community College
- Commuter
- Faith-Based/Religiously Affiliated
- Historically Black College/University
- Land Grant
- Liberal Arts
- Minority-Serving
- Professional
- Research/Comprehensive
- Residential
- Technical
- Tribal
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3. 2008-2009 full-time equivalent (FTE) undergraduate enrollment:

4. 2008-2009 full-time equivalent (FTE) graduate enrollment:

5. 2008-2009 full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty:

*6. Does your institution track student participation in community service/civic engagement activities separately from or together with student participation in service-learning, or neither? (Mark only one.)

- a) Separately
- b) Together
- c) We do not track either

Track Separately
1. During the 2008-2009 academic year, how many students were involved in:

   Community service/civic engagement activities?  __________

   Academic service-learning?  __________

Track Together
1. During the 2008-2009 academic year, how many students were involved in community service, service-learning, and civic engagement activities?  __________

Do Not Track Either
1. In your best estimate, how many students were involved in community service, service-learning, and civic engagement activities during the 2008-2009 academic year?  __________

Hours
1. On average, how many hours per week did each student participate in community service, service-learning, and civic engagement activities during the 2008-2009 academic year? (Note: If you have tracked the hours served, it will be necessary to calculate the average by dividing the total hours served by the total number of students serving, and then dividing the number of weeks in your academic calendar – usually 32 weeks.)  __________

Community Service/Service-Learning/Civic Engagement
1. How many academic service-learning courses did your institution offer in the 2008-2009 academic year?  __________
2. How many faculty taught an academic service-learning course in the 2008-2009 academic year?  

   ________
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3. How many staff supported community service, academic service-learning, and/or civic engagement during the 2008-2009 academic year?  

   ________

4. Which of the following issue areas are addressed by community service, service-learning, and/or civic engagement projects? (Check all that apply.)

   _____ Access and success in higher education
   _____ Agriculture/nutrition
   _____ Animal welfare
   _____ Civil rights/human rights
   _____ Conflict resolution
   _____ Crime/criminal justice
   _____ Disability issues
   _____ Disaster preparedness
   _____ Economic development
   _____ Environment/sustainability issues
   _____ Global citizenship
   _____ Health care, general
   _____ HIV/AIDS
   _____ Housing/homelessness
   _____ Hunger
   _____ Immigrants/migrant worker rights
   _____ International issues
   _____ K-12 education
   _____ Legal aid

   _____ Mental health
   _____ Mentoring
   _____ Multiculturalism/diversity
   _____ Parenting/child
   _____ Poverty
   _____ Public arts/theater
   _____ Reading/writing
   _____ Senior/elder services
   _____ Sexual assault
   _____ Substance abuse
   _____ Tax form preparation
   _____ Technology
   _____ Transportation
   _____ Tutoring
   _____ Voting
   _____ Women’s issues
   _____ Other (please specify):  

   ___________________________________________________________

Institutional Support/Culture

1. Does your institution have a mission or purpose statement that drives policies supporting community service, academic service-learning, and/or civic engagement? (OR that drives policies supporting the civic learning of students?)

   _____ Yes   _____ No

2. Is service/civic engagement explicitly stated in your institution’s strategic plan?

   _____ Yes   _____ No

3. Which of the following student outcomes are addressed in your institution’s strategic plan? (Check all that apply.)

   _____ Student leadership development
   _____ Student civic learning
   _____ Education for global citizenship
   _____ Student civic engagement
   _____ Service to the community (local, national, global)
   _____ Advocates of social issues
   _____ Careers for the public good
4. As part of the Association of American Colleges and University’s Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative, the Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) project focuses on the national conversation about student learning on a set of essential learning outcomes that faculty, employers, and community leaders say are critical for personal, social, career, and professional success in this century and this global environment. (Appendix L continued)

Which of the essential learning outcomes addressed in the project can be found in your institution’s strategic plan? (Check all that apply.)

_____ 1. Inquiry and analysis
_____ 2. Critical thinking
_____ 3. Creative thinking
_____ 4. Written communication
_____ 5. Oral communication
_____ 6. Quantitative literacy
_____ 7. Information literacy
_____ 8. Teamwork
_____ 9. Problem solving
_____ 10. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
_____ 11. Intercultural knowledge and competence
_____ 12. Ethical reasoning
_____ 13. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
_____ 14. Integrative learning

5. In what ways do students have a presence and voice in decision-making matters on your campus?

_____ Student(s) sit on academic committees
_____ Student(s) sit on budgetary committees
_____ Student(s) sit on hiring committees
_____ Student(s) serve on the Board of Trustees
_____ Student(s) have formal opportunities to discuss concerns with administration (e.g., public forums, known office hours)
_____ Student government has autonomous control of funds/activity fees
_____ Other (please specify): ____________________________________________________________

6. In what ways do community members have a presence and voice in decision-making matters on your campus? (Check all that apply).

_____ Community member(s) sit on academic committees
_____ Community member(s) sit on budgetary committees
_____ Community member(s) sit on hiring committees
_____ Community member(s) sit on the Board of Trustees
_____ Community member(s) have formal opportunities to discuss concerns with administration (e.g., public forums, publicly known office hours)
_____ Community member(s) are involved in developing program plans and/or grant proposals
_____ Other (please specify): ____________________________________________________________

Culture/Institutional Support

1. In what ways does your institution support faculty and staff in personally participating in service/volunteer activities? (Check all that apply).

_____ Paid time off to participate in service activities
_____ On-site service opportunities (e.g., blood drives, food drives, etc.)
1. Public recognition for service
   - Campus days of service to include staff and faculty
   - Opportunities to serve with students on service projects
   - Opportunities to serve with students as advisors to extracurricular service groups
   - Other (please specify): ____________________________________________________________
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2. Describe your president’s involvement in service/civic engagement activities. (Check all that apply).
   - Attends service/civic engagement conferences
   - Hosts service/civic engagement conferences
   - Participates in campus service/civic engagement activities
   - Provides fiscal support for community-based work
   - Solicts foundation or other support
   - Publicly promotes service/civic engagement
   - Writes publicly on service/civic engagement (e.g., op-eds, campus publications, national newspapers, etc.)
   - Speaks to alumni and trustees on service/civic engagement
   - Teaches service-learning course
   - Serves on community boards
   - Meets regularly with community partners/representatives
   - Other (please specify): ____________________________________________________________

3. In what ways are students involved in leading community service, academic service-learning, and/or civic engagement efforts on your campus? (Check all that apply).
   - Students assist in staffing the Community Service/Service-Learning/Civic Engagement Office
   - Students play a lead role in the direction of the Community Service/Service-Learning/Civic Engagement Office
   - Students recruit their peers
   - Students recruit faculty
   - Students act as liaisons to community sites
   - Students act as course assistants in the community
   - Students act as course assistants in the classroom
   - Students act as guest speakers in the classroom
   - Students act as co-instructors
   - Students help to design academic service-learning courses and create syllabi
   - Students assist with reflection activities
   - Students serve on campus service, service-learning, and/or civic engagement committees
   - Other (please specify): ____________________________________________________________

4. In what ways does your institution foster or support student community service, academic service-learning, and/or civic engagement? (Check all that apply).
   - Designates a period of time (e.g., day of service, service week, etc.) to highlight student civic engagement and/or service activities
   - Manages liability associated with service placements
   - Provides/coordinates transportation to and from community sites
   - Considers service formally in admissions process
   - Considers service in awarding scholarships
   - Defines and identifies academic service-learning courses
   - Requires academic service-learning as part of core curriculum in at least one major
Offers community service/civic engagement major and/or minor
Offers course on volunteerism
Offers courses on activism/advocacy
Designates academic service-learning courses in the course guide
Records service on student transcripts
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Gives extra credit for community service/civic engagement participation
Requires service for graduation
Gives awards to students for service
Offers mini-grants to students for service-related initiatives
Provides funding (e.g., scholarships, grants, fellowships, education awards, etc.) for student community service, academic service-learning, and/or civic engagement efforts
Hosts and/or funds public dialogues on current issues
Provides physical space/communication mechanisms for peaceful student protest
Provides space for student political organizations on campus
Other (please specify): ____________________________________________________________

5. Which of the following community service, academic service-learning, and/or civic engagement programs or programs does your institution office? (Check all that apply).

Alternative breaks
Alumni projects
Capstone courses
Discipline-based service-learning courses
Freshman year orientation to service
First-year experience service opportunities
Learning communities concerning engagement and service
Graduate school service
Government internships
International service opportunities
Inter-campus service programs
Nonprofit internships/practicum
One day service projects
Residence hall-based service
Summer service programs

6. What percentage of federal work study funds are dedicated to community service positions?

__________

7. Does your institution match the Segal AmeriCorps Education Award for students?

Yes  No

Community – Campus Partnerships
1. In which ways are community partners involved in student learning and engagement activities? (Check all that apply).

Act as co-instructors (uncompensated)
Act as co-instructors (compensated)
Assist in creating the syllabus and designing the course
Come into the class as speakers
Provide reflection on site in community setting
Provide feedback on the development/maintenance of community service programs
Participate in the design and delivery of community-based courses
Serve on campus committees

2. How many community partnerships does your institution have?

__________
3. What types of organizations are the partnerships with? (Check all that apply).
   _____ Faith-based organization(s)
   _____ For-profit business(es)
   _____ Government
   _____ K-12 school(s)
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   _____ Nonprofit/community-bases organization(s)
   _____ Other higher education institution(s)
   _____ Other (please specify): __________________________________________________________

Assessment
1. Does your institution, or units within your institution (departments or schools), have mechanisms to record engagement (service activities) in the community?
   _____ Yes, the institution does
   _____ Yes, units within the institution do
   _____ No
   If yes, describe: _______________________________________________________________________

2. Does your institution, or units within your institution (departments or schools), have mechanisms for systematic assessment of community perceptions of the institution’s engagement with community?
   _____ Yes, the institution does
   _____ Yes, units within the institution do
   _____ No
   If yes, describe: _______________________________________________________________________

3. Does your institution, or units within your institution (departments or schools), have mechanisms for systematic assessment of community impact?
   _____ Yes, the institution does
   _____ Yes, units within the institution do
   _____ No
   If yes, describe: _______________________________________________________________________

4. Does your institution or units within your institution (departments or schools), have mechanisms for systematic assessment of the impact of engagement on student learning?
   _____ Yes, the institution does
   _____ Yes, units within the institution do
   _____ No
   If yes, describe: _______________________________________________________________________

Campus Compact Membership
1. How would you rate the level of satisfaction with the services and resources your institution has received from Campus Compact (state and national offices)?
   _____ Very satisfied
   _____ Somewhat satisfied
   _____ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   _____ Somewhat dissatisfied
   _____ Very dissatisfied
2. Please indicate how valuable the following state and national Campus Compact programs and services are to you and those on your campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service/Program</th>
<th>Very Valuable</th>
<th>Somewhat Valuable</th>
<th>Not Valuable</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AmeriCorps*VISTA program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual membership survey statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Compact website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Campus Compact website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact Current newsletter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Campus Compact newsletter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact-sponsored conferences/workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Corps program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of presidential leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Newman Leadership Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative updates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model program information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource materials/support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-learning syllabi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Campus Compact email list news and information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State recognition programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State student programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support/training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Ehrlich Faculty Award for Service-Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Are there other services and resources provided by Campus Compact (state and/or national office) that you and/or those on your campus find valuable? Please list them below.

_____________________________________________________________________________________

Annual Survey Information
1. Did you have the necessary resources available to you to complete all questions in this survey on behalf of your institution?
   _____ Yes _____ No

2. Which question was most difficult to answer, and why?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

3. How will you and/or others at your institution use the information gathered for this survey? (Check all that apply).
   _____ Share with relevant contacts on campus
   _____ Share with relevant contacts in the community
_____ Share with current and/or prospective donors
_____ Share with prospective students
_____ Share with current students
_____ Share with alumni
_____ Use to complete the application for the Elective Carnegie Classification on Community Engagement
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_____ Use to complete the application for the President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll
_____ Use to inform strategic planning
_____ Use to inform accreditation

**State Questions**
*1. Some state Campus Compact’s have elected to ask additional questions. In which state are you located?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Located outside the US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Located outside the US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>